

THE SOCIALISM
OF TO-DAY



THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA
SANTA BARBARA
COLLEGE

PRESENTED BY

MRS. J. R. SACKRIDER

THE SOCIALISM OF TO-DAY

A SOURCE-BOOK OF THE PRESENT POSITION
AND RECENT DEVELOPMENT OF THE SO-
CIALIST AND LABOR PARTIES IN ALL COUN-
TRIES, CONSISTING MAINLY OF ORIGINAL
DOCUMENTS

EDITED BY

WILLIAM ENGLISH WALLING

J. G. PHELPS STOKES

JESSIE WALLACE HUGHAN

HARRY W. LAIDLER

AND OTHER MEMBERS OF A COMMITTEE OF THE
INTERCOLLEGIATE SOCIALIST SOCIETY



NEW YORK
HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY
1916

COPYRIGHT, 1916

BY

HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY

Published May, 1916

THE QUINN & BODEN CO. PRESS
RAHWAY, N. J.

HX
40
W3

PREFACE

FOR many years all books about Socialism—whether in favor or against it—were concerned mainly with theory. About the year 1900, Socialist and Labor parties grew to be political factors of importance in several of the great nations, developing programs of reform, the sincerity and practicality of which were beginning to be tested by experience. Then the second stage of Socialist literature set in; Socialism was presented, both by Socialists and by anti-Socialists, as a movement.

The time for a third stage is at hand, and it will mark a revolution in the treatment of the subject. Even when Socialism is regarded as a movement, the difficulty remains that it must be presented by an individual, who is either a Socialist or an anti-Socialist. In either case partisanship almost inevitably creeps in, and the reader's only recourse is to refer to a number of volumes before he can be certain he has secured a non-partisan and balanced view. The time has arrived when the educated public will demand that this great movement be discussed in a more rigidly scientific manner—a treatment that can be secured only by the publication of original documents with the minimum of editorial comment, the selection of such documents being made exclusively with a view to their importance and without regard to their tendency.

We believe that the present volume is the first international and comprehensive source-book dealing with the Socialist movement in any language. The Socialists have limited their collection of documents either to single na-

tions or to the proceedings of the International Socialist Congresses. We have utilized all of these sources together with many others, such as Socialist speeches in parliaments, and in this way we have endeavored to cover all the important nations, and all the topics that have been in the foreground of discussion in recent years. The only exception is the relation of the Socialists to war, which is covered in a separate companion volume edited by one of our editors (*The Socialists and the War*, by W. E. Walling, Henry Holt and Company). We devote an important chapter, however, to the Socialist position on militarism, without duplicating any of the documents of that volume—since we here deal chiefly with the domestic aspect of the question.

We believe the recent development of the world's Socialist and Labor parties has shown that they have enough in common to justify their treatment as a *more or less* unified whole. We have made no effort, however, in our selection and arrangement of quotations, to suggest agreement between the various parties or even between the factions of the same party. Whether the obvious differences at present existing are merely temporary or crucial and irreconcilable it remains for history to show.

The book has been edited with the genuine co-operation of a number of persons. Those mentioned as editors have done the bulk of the work. Others contributing substantially were Alice K. Boehme, Joseph L. Cohen, Paul H. Douglas, Felix Grendon, Nicholas Kelley, Paul Kennaday, Margaret Rambaut, H. D. Sedgwick, John Spargo, Caro Lloyd, and Alexander Trachtenberg.

The editors and all who co-operated with them are members of an organization of college men and women devoted exclusively to promoting the study of Socialism, and they were chosen and delegated by this organization to carry

out the present work. We believe that the Intercollegiate Socialist Society has demonstrated, by publications and activities extending through ten years, that it is equipped to perform such a task efficiently and was to be relied upon to execute it in a liberal and non-partisan spirit. Although a large part of our membership is composed of Socialists, we include the most divergent schools of Socialist thought, while a large portion of our members are non-Socialists, and some are anti-Socialists interested in securing a broad and reliable discussion of the subject.

Therefore, the present volume, like all the rest of our work, is dedicated to all persons who wish to understand the Socialist movement as it is—whatever may be their personal opinions concerning it.

THE EDITORS.

CONTENTS

PART I

THE SOCIALIST PARTIES OF THE WORLD

Section I

THE INTERNATIONAL

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE SOCIALISTS AND THE NEW INTERNATIONAL	3

Historical Sketch—First Congress of Paris, 1889—Resolution on the Eight Hour Day—Congress of Brussels, 1891—Congress of Zurich, 1893—Admission of Labor Unions Under Certain Conditions—Political Tactics—Congress of London, 1896—Political Tactics—Exclusion of Anarchists—Second Congress of Paris, 1900—Political Tactics—Question of Coalition Ministries—Formation of International Socialist Bureau—Congress of Amsterdam, 1904—Political Tactics—Coalition Ministries—Discussion Between Bebel and Jaurès—Vote of the International Socialist Movement.

Section II

SOCIALISM ON THE CONTINENT OF EUROPE

II. GERMANY	27
-----------------------	----

The Socialist Vote—Relative Strength of Political Parties—Recent Political Development—Party Membership—Strength of Socialism in Advanced Sections—Occupations and Religion of Socialist Members of Reichstag—Program of Party—Socialist Appeals on First and Second Ballots in 1912 Elections—Private Agreement—Opposition Within the Party—Action of 1912 Party Congress—Kautsky and Bernstein on Meaning of the Socialist Victory—The Test Year in the Reichstag—Socialist Program in Prussian Elections, May, 1913—Republican Demonstration in the Reichstag, June 3, 1914.

III. FRANCE	57
-----------------------	----

Introductory—Electoral Tactics—Resolution on the Election of 1914—Election Manifesto of Socialist Party—Results of Election—Jean Jaurès on Victory.

CHAPTER	PAGE
IV. BELGIUM	70
Introductory—Socialist Tactics in Election of 1914— Results of Election—Causes of Victory—Manifesto of Labor Party—Reorganization of Party.	
V. ITALY	76
Introductory—Declaration of Socialist Party Against War in Tripoli—Split in Party—Declaration of Regular Party—Declaration of Reformist Socialist Party—Elec- toral Tactics in 1913 Elections—Action of Executive Committee—Tactics on Second Ballot—Electoral Mani- festo—Situation Before the Elections—Results of Elec- tion—Comments on Socialist Success—Resolution of Parliamentary Group After Election—Resolution upon Resignation of Giolitti Ministry—Discussion of Free- masonry at 1914 Party Congress—Disobedient Party Deputies After the Congress—Disobedient Party Branches —Further Effects of Position.	
VI. RUSSIA AND FINLAND	95
Introductory to Russia—Elections of 1912—Tactics and Composition of Social Democratic Group in Fourth Duma—Expulsion of Members and Resignation of Milinovsni from Duma—Republican Demonstration in Duma—Russian Social Democratic Unity Conference, Brussels, 1914—Constitutional Struggles in Russia— The Movement in Finland—Social Democratic Party Convention, 1914.	
VII. HOLLAND (AND SWITZERLAND)	108
Introductory to Holland—Party Congress of 1914— Socialist Party Program—Results of Elections—General Political Situation—The Ministerial Crisis and the So- cial Democracy—History of Swiss Social Democratic Movement.	
VIII. DENMARK, SWEDEN AND NORWAY	129
Introductory to Denmark—Socialist Support of the Government—The Constitutional Crisis—General Suf- frage—Effect of the War on Suffrage—The Political Situation—Introductory to Sweden—Socialists Favor a Republic—Swedish Parliamentary Elections of 1914— Election Appeal—Results of Election—The Question of the Coalition Ministry—The Party Congress of 1915— The Elections of 1915—The General Position of the So- cialist Movement in Norway.	

CONTENTS

xi

CHAPTER	PAGE
IX. AUSTRIA AND HUNGARY	155
Introductory to Austria—Bauer on Perils of Reformism—Introduction to the Hungarian Movement—Congress of Social Democratic Party, 1913—Political Jugglery in Hungary, 1914.	
X. SPAIN AND PORTUGAL	172
Introductory to Spain—Iglesias on Situation in Spain—Introductory to Portugal—General Political Situation.	
XI. ROUMANIA, BULGARIA AND GREECE	181
Introductory to Roumania—Socialist Party Political and Agrarian Programs, 1910—Plea for Unity Among Bulgarian Socialists—Introductory to Movement in Greece.	

Section III

THE SOCIALIST MOVEMENT IN AMERICA

XII. THE PRESENT STATUS OF SOCIALISM IN THE UNITED STATES	191
Membership of the Socialist Party by Years—By States—Membership in Proportion to Population of States—Vote Compared with that of Other Parties—Socialist Vote of 1914—Officers of the Party.	
XIII. THE NATIONAL PROGRAM	199
The Socialist Party Platform—Report of U. S. Congressman Berger.	
XIV. THE STATE PROGRAMS	210
Report of Committee on State Program, Convention of 1912—New York State Program, 1914—Pennsylvania State Program, 1912—Montana State Program, 1912—Oklahoma State Program—Wisconsin State Program, 1912—Socialists in Wisconsin Legislature.	
XV. POLICY AND TACTICS	221
Discussion of the Importance of Political Action, by Victor Berger, Charles Edward Russell, William D. Haywood, Eugene V. Debs—Party Organization—Constitution of Socialist Party—Amendment to Constitution Regarding the Party Owned Press—Regarding a Change in Members' Pledge—Proposed Union of American Socialist Parties—Report of Socialist Party Delegation to the International Socialist Congress, Copenhagen, 1910.	

CHAPTER	PAGE
XVI. CANADA	235
History of the Canadian Socialist Party—Socialist Party in 1914—Platform—History of the Social Democratic Party—Platform—The Labor Movement in Canada.	
XVII. CENTRAL AND SOUTH AMERICA	243
Address of de Larra of Mexico—Proclamation of Socialist Party on Mexican War—Introductory to Argentine Republic—The Argentine Party and Nationalism.	
<i>Section IV</i>	
SOCIALISM IN BRITISH EMPIRE (EXCLUDING CANADA)	
XVIII. THE BRITISH INDEPENDENT LABOR PARTY AND THE BRITISH SOCIALIST PARTY	255
Introductory—Excerpts from Constitution of British Labor Party—Growth of Labor Party—Program of Independent Labor Party—Parliamentary Activities—Criticism and Defense of Labor Party, by Robert Smillie, J. Ramsay MacDonald, Philip Snowden—Resolution Against British System of Party Legislation—Speech of Mover—Speech of F. W. Jowett—The Basis of the Socialist Party—The Conference of 1914.	
XIX. THE BRITISH LABOR PARTY	266
The British Labor Party in Parliament, 1912—The Party Conference of 1913—Labor Party in Parliament, 1914—Discussion of Party Tactics—Conference of 1910—Labor Party and a Program.	
XX. THE FABIAN SOCIETY AND SOCIALIST UNITY	285
Introductory to Fabian Society—Basis of the Society—The Fabians and Socialist Unity—Annual Conference, 1914—Socialist Unity on the Basis of Common Action with Labor Party—Manifesto of International Socialist Bureau—The Unity Conference—Discussion of British Socialist Party—Declaration of Executive Committee of B. S. P.	
XXI. IRELAND	299
The Political Situation in Ireland—Speech by James Larkin.	
XXII. AUSTRALIA	309
The Australian Labor Party—Introductory—Elections of 1913—National Referenda—Federal Elections—Growth of the Labor Party Elections, 1913—Comment in <i>Labor</i>	

CONTENTS

xiii

CHAPTER

PAGE

Vote in 1914—The Labor Party in the States—Manifesto of the Labor Party Elections, 1913—Comment in *Labor Leader*, *Vorwaerts*, *New Statesman*, *The Socialist*, on 1913 Elections—Election Manifesto of Australian Labor Party, 1914—Election Campaign of 1914—Legislative Achievements—Future of Labor Party—Report of Australian Socialist Party to International Socialist Congress of Vienna.

XXIII. NEW ZEALAND 340

Introductory—From Editorial in *New Statesman*—Foundation of Social Democratic Party—Program of Social Democratic Party, 1913—The Election of 1914—Review and Forecast—Questions for Parliamentary Candidates Proposed by the Social Democratic Party, 1914—The Labor Representation Committee.

XXIV. SOUTH AFRICA 354

Introductory—The Labor Party and the Elections of 1913.

Section V

SOCIALISM IN CHINA

XXV. CHINA 357

Introductory—Interview with Sun Yat Sen.

PART II

THE SOCIALIST PARTIES AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS

I. SOCIALIST PARTIES AND THE LABOR UNIONS 373

The International Congress of Stuttgart, 1907—Congress of the French Party, 1907—Same, 1912—Discussion in the United States—Syndicalism Defined—Convention of 1912—Debs on Industrial Unionism—Spargo, Socialist Convention, Haywood, Debs on *Sabotage*.

II. THE GENERAL STRIKE 389

The International Socialist Congress of London, 1896—Of Amsterdam, 1904—Of Stuttgart, 1907—The General Strike in Belgium, 1913—Causes Leading to Strike—Special Congress of Labor Party, 1912—Speech of Vandervelde—Preparations for Strike, Congress of 1913—Report of Anseele—Speech of Vandervelde—Resolution Adopted—Conclusion of Strike, Congress of 1913—Speech of Vandervelde—Discussion of Success of Strike

—Correspondence in *Vorwaerts*—In *New Statesman*—The Proposed General Strike for Equal Suffrage in Prussia—Resolution of the Party Executive—Resolution of the Minority—Scheideman Speaking for the Executive Committee—Bernstein for the Majority—Rosa Luxemburg for the Minority—Bauer for the Majority—Liebknecht for the Minority—Statement of Belgian Delegates—Scheideman, Closing the Debate—*Vorwaerts*, Editorial Summary—The General Strike in Italy, 1914—The General Strike in Russia, 1914—The General Strike in New Zealand, 1913.

III. COMPULSORY ARBITRATION OF LABOR DISPUTES 431

Discussion at Conference of British Labor Party, 1913—Experience of New Zealand—Compulsory Arbitration in Australia.

IV. THE SOCIALIST PROGRAM OF LABOR AND SOCIAL LEGISLATION 438

Program of Copenhagen Congress, 1910—Resolution at British Labor Party Conference, 1913, on the National Minimum—Conference of British Labor Party, 1914, the Feeding of School Children.

V. UNEMPLOYMENT 441

The International Congress of Copenhagen, 1910—The German Congress of 1913—Official Report to the Proposed International Congress of Vienna, 1914, by Vaillant.

VI. THE HIGH COST OF LIVING 446

The British Labor Party Conference, 1914, State Regulated Prices—The French Party Congress, 1914—The Webb Report for the Proposed International Congress of Vienna, 1914.

VII. AGRICULTURE 453

The International Congress of London, 1896—Official Report to the French Party Congress of 1912 by Com-père-Morel—The Program Adopted by the Danish Congress, 1913—Recent Tendencies of Agricultural Concentration in the United States, by A. M. Simons—The Agrarian Program in the United States, 1912—The Agrarian Program in Oklahoma, 1912.

VIII. THE LAND 469

The British Labor Party Conference of 1914—Conference of British Independent Labor Party, 1914—Conference of British Socialist Party, 1914.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	xv PAGE
IX. THE TRUSTS	475
The International Socialist Congress of Paris, 1900— Of Amsterdam, 1904.	
X. GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP	477
The Socialist Group in the German Reichstag, 1913— The British Labor Party Conference, 1913—The Report on Currency to the National Committee of the Socialist Party of the United States, 1914.	
XI. IMPORT DUTIES	481
The Italian Congress of 1914—The American Conven- tion of 1912.	
XII. TAXATION	485
The German Congress of 1913—Article by Wendel— Report by Wurm—Resolution of Congress.	
XIII. IMMIGRATION AND THE RACE PROBLEM	495
The International Congress of Stuttgart, 1907—The American Congress of 1910, Asiatic Immigration—Con- gress of 1912, Same—Resolution on the Dillingham Bill —The American National Committee, 1913—Debs on the Japanese Question—The American Party and the Negro, Resolutions of 1901—The Australian Labor Party, 1914 The Australian Workers' Union, 1914—The South African Labor Party, 1913.	
XIV. MILITARISM	509
The French Congress of 1912—Jaurès on Militarism in the Chamber of Deputies, 1913—The Italian Congress of 1914—The American Party Congress of 1912—Con- scription and the Australian Labor Party, from the <i>Daily Citizen</i> (London), the <i>International Socialist Re- view</i> , the <i>New Statesman</i> (London).	
XV. PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION	523
The American Congress of 1912—The Conference of the British Labor Party, 1914.	
XVI. MUNICIPAL SOCIALISM	532
The International Congress of Paris, 1900—The Berlin Municipal Election of 1913—The French Party Municipal Program, 1912, on Political, Economic, Financial, Educa- tional, Charitable, Health and Housing Reforms—Co- operation with Other Parties in Municipal Elections, Dis- cussion at Italian Congress, 1914—Resolution Adopted— Criticism by Oda Olberg—The Municipal Program—The	

Italian Municipal Elections of 1914—General Results—Victories at Naples and Ancona—The General Strike and Municipal Elections—The Municipal Program in the United States—Discussion of the Commission Form of City Government at the Convention of 1912—A Suggested Model City Charter—A Suggested Municipal Program—Municipal Platform of New York City, 1913—Socialist Administration in Berkeley—Socialist Administration in Butte—Message of Mayor Lunn of Schenectady—Socialist Municipal Platform in Schenectady—Message of Mayor Seidel of Milwaukee—Accomplishments in Milwaukee—Socialist Municipal Platform—Municipal Taxation, from British Fabian Tract by Sidney Webb.

XVII. CO-OPERATION 582

International Congress of Copenhagen, 1910—American Socialist Convention of 1912—The Majority Report Adopted by the Convention—The Minority Report—Speech of W. R. Gaylord, Favoring the Report.

XVIII. THE DRINK QUESTION 586

Report to the Proposed International Socialist Congress of Vienna, 1914, by Vandervelde—The French Congress of 1914—The American Congress of 1912.

XIX. WOMAN SUFFRAGE 594

The International Congress of Stuttgart, 1907—The Conference of the British Labor Party, 1913—Congressman Berger's Resolution, U. S., 1912.

XX. EDUCATION 602

The Struggle of the Belgian Socialists for non-Sectarian Education—Manifesto of the General Council of the Labor Party Against the Sectarian School Law—Declaration of the Socialist Group in the Senate After the Passage of the Law—Report on Industrial Education, American Party Convention, 1912.

APPENDIX

PREPAREDNESS 609

INDEX 633

PART I

THE SOCIALIST PARTIES OF THE WORLD

SECTION I

THE INTERNATIONAL

CHAPTER I

THE SOCIALISTS AND THE NEW INTERNATIONAL *

I. HISTORICAL SKETCH

“ON one of the last days of November, 1847, a handful of political refugees, mostly Germans, met in an obscure clubroom in East London to hear the report of two of their associates who had undertaken to prepare a statement of principles to be issued in the name of their organization, the Communist League. It was a most unusual document, that Communist Manifesto, to which they listened in rapt attention—a searching analysis of modern society in the light of historical and economic science, a challenge to all established powers, a ringing battle-cry, a comprehensive program, and all within the space, say, of eight pages of this [the *Metropolitan*] magazine. At the closing words—‘Workingmen of all countries, unite! You have nothing to lose but your chains; you have a world to gain!’—the little gathering voted enthusiastic approval and resolved to give this declaration the widest publicity their scanty means would permit. They felt that,

* This brief statement of the origin of the Socialist movement, by Algernon Lee, one of the best known of American Socialist writers, appeared in the *Metropolitan Magazine* for July, 1914.

though the words were the words of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, the real author was the working-class itself, then just beginning to wake to a consciousness of its wrongs, its rights, and its power. . . .

“The Socialist movement, which was born that November day, grew very slowly at first. The International Workingmen’s Association did not come into being till 1864. Twelve years later it was dissolved, and its enemies joyfully announced that ‘Socialism is dead.’ Their rejoicing was premature. The preceding year, 1875, had seen the foundation of the Social Democratic Party in Germany, in several other countries Socialist parties were taking form, and it soon became evident that the movement was actually stronger than ever before. No national frontiers could confine it, no racial antipathies could withstand the force with which it fused the working-people into one brotherhood. Wherever the railway and the factory made their appearance, wherever peasants and handicraftsmen were being transformed into industrial wage-workers, there Socialism sprang up, with Trade-Unionism by its side. . . .

“In 1889 the first of a new series of International Socialist Congresses was held at Paris, and similar gatherings have since taken place at intervals of two to four years. The ninth was the special congress which met at Basel in November, 1912, to concert measures for preventing the Balkan conflict from embroiling the great nations in a general war. . . .

“The new International is not a centralized body. The party in each country enjoys full autonomy, but all are kept in mutual touch through the permanent International Socialist Bureau, which has its office in Brussels; and all send delegates to the congresses, where questions of principle and policy are discussed with the utmost

freedom, sometimes so sharply that outside observers think the movement is sure to split in twain. . . .

“In every country the nucleus of the movement is an organized party whose members pay monthly dues and which carries on a many-sided and year-round campaign by means of lectures, study classes, mass meetings, street-corner speeches, sale of newspapers, magazines, books and pamphlets, distribution of leaflets, and other activities. Germany has, of course, the largest party, with more than a million members; the United States already has over one hundred thousand. . . .

“Ten years ago the voting strength of Socialism throughout the world was between five and six millions. To-day, on the most moderate computation, it exceeds eleven millions. Taking into account the limitation of the suffrage in various countries, it is safe to say that the number of its avowed adherents is three or four times greater than that shown at the polls—say ten per cent of the adult population of the civilized world.”

The following review of the first seven International Congresses—from that of Paris in 1889 to that of Stuttgart in 1907—is taken from the account of Jean Longuet, grandson of Karl Marx, and one of the secretaries of the French Socialist Party, in the volume entitled *Le Mouvement Socialiste Internationale* of the series called the *Encyclopédie Socialiste*, edited by Compère-Morel. The account of the Copenhagen Congress (1910) is taken from the report of the American Socialist delegation. The reports to the proposed Vienna Congress of 1914 are from the summaries of the Socialist press.

All important Socialist discussions and resolutions relating directly to war are to be found in William English Walling's volume, *Socialists and the War*. Thus the

special congress of Basel (1913), the discussion of measures to be taken in case of war at the congresses of 1891, 1893, 1900, 1907, and 1910, the discussion of colonialism in 1910, and the report on imperialism for the proposed congress of Vienna (1914) are omitted from this volume and presented in the other.

II. CONGRESS OF PARIS, 1889

(From Longuet)

“The first congress of the new International Socialist movement was held at Paris on the one-hundredth anniversary of the taking of the Bastille, July 14, 1889. Besides 221 French delegates, it included an imposing delegation from beyond the Rhine. Our German comrades were then in the midst of the full tide of Bismarckian reaction and the régime of the anti-Socialist law—under which the entire Socialist press was suppressed, and militants filled the imperial prisons. But their superb organization came out victorious from all these trials, and they sent 81 delegates. In their name, the old soldier of the revolution, William Liebknecht, said: ‘Laboring Germany and laboring France are uniting at this moment. This is not a congress of ideologists; we are contracting an alliance which will have its effect in the entire world.’

“In the German delegation, besides Liebknecht, were Bebel, Bernstein, Molkenbuhr, Vollmar, Clara Zetkin, and the majority of the Socialist members of the Reichstag.

“England had 22 delegates, among whom were J. Keir Hardie, John Burns, Eleanor Marx (youngest daughter of Karl Marx), and Cunningham Graham.

“Belgium had 14 delegates, including Anseele, César de Paepe, Jean Volders, Defuisseaux; Austria had 8, one of whom was Victor Adler; Spain sent 2, one being Pablo

Inglesias; Holland sent 4, including Domela Nieuwenhuis and van Vliegen; Italy 5, including Andrea Costa and A. Cipriani; Russia 6, among whom were Pierre Lavroff and Georges Plechhanoff. There were also at the Congress 3 Swedish comrades, 1 Bulgarian, 5 Roumanians, 5 Americans, 3 Norwegians, 3 Danes, 1 Portuguese, 1 Bohemian, 5 Poles, including L. Winiarsky, 3 Hungarians, including the former minister of labor of the Commune, Leo Franckel.

“Never before had there been so representative an assembly of the proletariat of all countries. Never had the International appeared more alive, more vigorous, than in arising from the tomb in which the reaction following the Paris Commune of 1871 had seemingly buried it.

“French Socialism at this time was marred by deep internal discord. The groups of the ‘Possibilist’ Labor Party, together with the Parisian labor unions, quarreled with the groups of the Labor Party of Guesde, the central revolutionary committee, and the national federation of unions, over the right of representing France at the Congress.

“The Germans tried to arrange a preliminary conference so as to elect a common organizing committee for the Congress. The ‘possibilists’ refused to participate in it or to meet with the other French groups. The latter, therefore, in conjunction with the delegates from the English Social Democratic Federation, and certain English trade-unionists, organized separately. The Belgian, Italian, and Dutch delegates participated in both assemblies. Thus two congresses developed and continued to meet separately. Fusion was not effected.”

III. THE CONGRESS OF BRUSSELS, 1891

(From Longuet)

“This Congress brought about the union of the elements represented in the two separate congresses of Paris. For the first time since 1882, they deliberated together—though only for a few days—the antagonistic factions in the French section still needing many years for the realization of complete unity. Besides the resolution on war [which is included in *Socialists and the War*] this Congress concerned itself with defining the Socialist attitude towards social reform and labor legislation. The Congress ‘placed itself on the ground of the class struggle, in the conviction that there can be no possibility of the emancipation of the working-class as long as there are ruling classes.’ This resolution was voted unanimously. The eloquent young leader of the Belgian Socialists, Émile Vandervelde, celebrated the occurrence in these terms: ‘For the first time revolutionary Socialists and Trade-Unionists have found themselves in agreement in proclaiming the necessity of the class struggle. There is a new fact without precedent; the Socialists of the entire world are united, according to the words of Karl Marx: “Proletariat of the world, unite.” ’ ’ ’

For a further account of this Congress see Part II, Chapter IV, “Labor Legislation.”

IV. THE CONGRESS OF ZURICH, 1893

(From Longuet)

“This Congress concerned itself chiefly with consideration of the general strike as a means of preventing war and ‘parliamentarism.’

“The admission of the ‘anarchists’ to the Congress had

first to be considered. [By 'anarchists,' Longuet here means those revolutionists who, while seeking a socialistic order of society, yet oppose political action *as a means* for attaining it, or who favor political action in elections only as a means of agitation, but without reliance upon parliamentary action]. This question was complicated by certain German anti-parliamentarists ('Independents' and 'Young Socialists,') who had withdrawn from the International after the Congress of Erfurt, 1891, and who were claiming admission to the Zurich Congress. The debate was violent and absorbed the first two days' session. After a vigorous speech by Bebel, 'who defined political action as the utilization by the proletariat of political rights and legislation for the conquest of political power,' and who asked 'why they were going to lose three days in discussing with people that it would be necessary to put out at the end of the third day,' the Congress adopted by vote of 16 nationalities against 2 (Spain and France) the resolution which has become famous under the name of the Resolution of Zurich.

"One of its leading principles was as follows: 'All labor unions, as well as those parties and Socialist organizations which recognize the necessity of working-class organization and of political action, are to be admitted to the Congress.'

"The Congress adopted Bebel's definition of political action as given above, and the anti-parliamentary factions were excluded.

"The proposal of an international general strike against war was brought up by the Dutch, but the immense majority voted against it. They also asked that the Congress should recommend to the labor parties of all countries to 'make use of the elections solely as a means of agitation,' and to 'forbid the elected representatives of

the proletariat from taking part in the labor of Parliament.'

"Liebknecht forcefully refuted this conception. Tactics are a matter of an essentially practical nature: There is no such thing as revolutionary or reactionary tactics. Only the aim is revolutionary. Tactics vary from one epoch to another, from one country to another. If Germany was to-day in the situation of Russia, the German Socialists would employ no other tactics than those of the Russian terrorists. . . . Like tactics, political power is itself neither reactionary nor revolutionary. What it is depends upon those who exercise it. It is only an instrument which does whatever the party that manipulates it wishes. . . . 'Let us believe in acts, rather than in words,' he declared. 'If the proletariat wishes to emancipate itself from the capitalist yoke, it must first emancipate itself from the yoke of the revolutionary phrase.'" The following resolution was passed:

"1. It is necessary that the workers of all countries should organize nationally and internationally into labor unions and other organizations for struggling against their exploiters;

"2. Political action is necessary not only from the point of view of agitation and of the affirmation of Socialist principles as a whole, but also from the point of view of the realization of reforms of immediate interest. Consequently we recommend to the workers of all countries to conquer political rights, and to make use of them in all legislative and administrative boards, for the purpose of realizing the demands of the proletariat, and to gain possession of political power which is to-day only an instrument of capitalist domination in order to transform it into a means of the emancipation of the proletariat;

"3. The form of political and economic struggle must be determined according to circumstances by the various nationalities. But in all cases the revolutionary aim of the Socialist movement must be made fundamental. Namely *the complete transformation of present society* from the economic, moral, and political points of view. (Our italics.)

"In no case can political action be used for compromise or for alliances, which would contradict the principles and the independence of Socialist parties."

This resolution was adopted by all the nationalities, except Holland. It was supplemented by an amendment in favor of the initiative, referendum, and proportional representation.

V. THE CONGRESS OF LONDON, 1896

(From Longuet)

"The battle between the parliamentarians and the anti-parliamentarians was renewed with vigor. Divisions among the French delegates added to the intensity of the conflict. Under the leadership of Fernand Pelloutier, secretary of the Federation of Labor Exchanges, 'syndicalists' sought admission to the Congress as representatives of the labor exchanges. They were supported by the 'Allemanistes' and 'Blanquists.' A majority of the French section endeavored to secure repudiation by the Congress of the Zurich resolution of 1893, but the Congress reaffirmed this resolution by vote of 17 nationalities against 2 (France and Holland), and declared:

"1. The Congress means by political action all forms of organized struggle for the conquest of political power, and its use in the legislative, and administration of state and municipality by the working-class for the purpose of its emancipation.

"2. The Congress declares that the conquest of political power is the best means by which the workers may achieve their emancipation, the freedom of the man and the citizen, the best means by which they can establish the Socialist Republic.

"It appeals to the workers of all countries to unite in a party, separate from all bourgeois political parties, and to demand adult suffrage, the second ballot, and the initiative and referendum, nationally and locally.

"3. The Congress declares also that the emancipation of

woman is inseparable from that of the worker, and appeals to the women of all countries to organize politically with the workers.

“The adoption by the Congress of the following motion of Wilhelm Liebknecht established a precedent which has effected the exclusion of anarchist factions from all further congresses of the International:

“The executive of the Congress is instructed to issue an invitation to the next congress, exclusively to the following:

“1. The representatives of groups which aim at the substitution of Socialist property and production for capitalist property and production, and which consider legislative and parliamentary action as one of the means necessary to attain this end.

“2. To organizations of a labor union character which, *though undertaking no aggressive politics*, acknowledge the necessity of legislative and parliamentary action. As a consequence, the anarchists are excluded.” (Our italics.)

(See also Part II, Chapter II, “The General Strike.”)

VI. THE CONGRESS OF PARIS, 1900

(From Longuet)

“This Congress was held under very unfavorable conditions. The ‘ministerial question’ was raging, the Socialist Millerand having accepted a portfolio in the French Cabinet without the consent of the French Socialists. Violent controversy had arisen with regard to his conduct and the precedent involved. This controversy was taken to the Congress for adjudication. After a vigorous political debate in which Ferri, Kautsky, Auer, Guesde, Jaurès, Vandervelde, and others took part, a finely shaded motion, edited by Karl Kautsky, the great theorist of the German movement, was adopted, as follows:

“The proletariat in a modern democratic state cannot obtain political power accidentally. It can do so only when the long and difficult work of political and economic organization of the

proletariat is at an end, when its physical and moral regeneration has been accomplished, and when more and more seats have been won in municipal and other legislative bodies.

"But where the government is centralized, political power cannot be obtained step by step. If an individual Socialist becomes a cabinet minister, that cannot be regarded as a normal commencement of the seizure of political power by the proletariat. It must be looked upon only as a temporary makeshift.

"Whether in any particular set of circumstances such a makeshift ought to be adopted is a question not of principles but of tactics, on which the Congress can make no decision. But in any case this dangerous experiment can be of use only if it is agreed upon by the party as a whole, and *on the understanding that the Socialist minister is, and remains, the representative of this party.* (Our italics.)

"Where the Socialist minister becomes independent of his party, where he ceases to be its representative, his entry into the Cabinet becomes a means of weakening rather than of strengthening the proletariat; it tends, not to bring nearer the time when the proletariat shall have political power in its own hands, but rather to postpone it.

"Plechanoﬀ proposed the following amendment, which was also adopted:

"The Congress lays it down that a Socialist is bound to resign from a bourgeois cabinet if the organized party declares that the Cabinet has in any way acted unfairly in the economic struggle between Capital and Labor.

"This resolution was adopted by the votes of 24 nations to 9 (each 'nation' had two votes). The opposition was made up of the 2 votes of Bulgaria and Ireland and 1 each of Poland, Russia, Italy, the United States, and, of course, France.

"On the question of alliances with other parties, the Congress declared:

"The class struggle forbids every kind of alliance with any faction whatever of the capitalist class, unless exceptional cir-

cumstances may make coalitions necessary in some places—that is, without any confusion of program or tactics—coalitions which the party must reduce to the minimum until their complete elimination; they cannot be tolerated except in so far as their necessity is recognized by the district or national organization to which the groups which compose them [i.e. which enter them] belong.”

This Congress also laid the foundation for the first *permanent* organization, to continue the work of the International Congresses. This resulted in the formation of the International Socialist Bureau. The bureau is composed of permanent delegates from each country, called “international secretaries”—the larger countries naming two each, the smaller countries one. It held one or more sessions every year from 1904 to 1914 inclusive. In the meanwhile it was represented by an executive committee, composed of Belgian Socialists, with its headquarters at the Maison du Peuple at Brussels. From its organization up to the present time Émile Vandervelde has been the chairman of this committee and Camille Huysmans has been its secretary.

VII. THE CONGRESS OF AMSTERDAM, 1904

(From Official Report)

At this Congress, as at the Congress of Paris, the chief subject of discussion was whether or not Socialists should be allowed to form a part of progressive capitalistic governments in coalition with non-Socialist parties. Millerand's participation in the recent Waldeck-Rousseau ministry still occasioned acrimonious controversy. The French Socialists were at this time divided into two entirely separate parties: one, headed by Jaurès, indorsed Millerand's action; the other, headed by Guesde, opposed

it. As the Socialists of the South German countries, Bavaria, Würtemberg, and Baden, had shown by recent action that they were in substantial agreement with Jaurès—at least to the extent of voting in favor of the budgets of existing governments, under certain circumstances—the matter had been taken up by the German Party at their recent congress at Dresden, where a resolution had been passed by a majority of 288 to 11 votes, condemning the Jaurès “revisionist” position. This same resolution was presented to the Amsterdam Congress, and adopted by a vote of 25 to 5 (12 not voting). It was known as the Dresden resolution, and was as follows:

The Congress expresses its entire disapproval of the revisionist policy—that is, of the attempt to change our well-trying and successful policy of the class war by giving up all efforts to seize the political power out of the hands of our opponents and replace such tactics by compromising with them.

The result of the revisionist tactics would be that the party which is striving for the speediest replacement of the existing system by one on Socialist lines, the party which, therefore, in the best sense of the term is revolutionary, would become merely one for amending existing society.

And, therefore, the Congress holds, in disagreement with the revisionists, that *class opposition* cannot be smoothed over, but that, on the contrary, it *becomes constantly greater*, and it declares:

1. That the party declines all responsibility for the political and economic conditions which arise out of the capitalist system of production, and accordingly refuses to support any action which tends to keep the existing ruling class in power.

2. That in accordance with the resolution of Kautsky at the International Socialist Congress in Paris in the year 1900, *Social Democracy cannot exercise supreme power in society as at present constituted.*

The Congress further disapproves of any attempt to make light of class differences in order to smooth the way for union with the non-Socialist parties.

The Congress looks to the Social Democratic parties to use

the influence which an increased membership and an increased number of votes gives them, to continue to spread information as to what is the aspiration of Social Democracy, and in accordance with the principles of our program, to push forward with all their might the interests of the working-classes, to extend and to safeguard political freedom and equal rights everywhere, to oppose even more energetically than before the spirit of militarism, whether on land or on water, to oppose all colonial and imperial policy, and all injustice, oppression, and exploitation in every form, and finally to extend social legislation in every direction and to make it possible for the working-classes to fulfill their destiny in the political and the general life of the age. (Our italics.)

Kautsky's resolution with Plechanoff's amendment, as adopted by the Paris Congress of 1900, was reaffirmed.

The discussion at this Congress was of such exceptional importance that we quote the very significant speeches of Bebel and Jaurès on the two sides of the question at issue, the fundamental question of Socialist politics.

The speech of Jean Jaurès was, in part, as follows:

We demand that we [the International Congress] take account of the Socialist, revolutionary, republican proletariat who have opposed those of the other Socialist faction in France who declared that the republic, and the secularization of the schools were not worth an hour's time of the proletariat, and ought to be sacrificed for the hope of the automatic installation of a collectivist régime through the play of blind forces. It is we who will demand an account of Vaillant for his denial of the secular, revolutionary, republican traditions of the Blanquists. (Applause.)

It is not the situation in France that disturbs me. I thoroughly recognize that impliedly or explicitly the Dresden resolution recognizes the double necessity of an immediate and of a revolutionary Socialist action. It is right in saying that Socialism must be carried on by a class organization, independent in its end and actions and devoted to the complete transformation of the capitalist system with the object of abolishing all exploitation and restoring to the collective workers all the fruits

of their labor. All our reforms have for their revolutionary object the emancipation of oppressed and exploited labor. (Applause.) But you must recognize that Socialism must make its appeal to all the forces of democracy if it is to accomplish immediate reforms. We must not cease to grasp and to utilize democratic evolution to further proletarian evolution whenever it has need of such assistance.

I have heard Guesde [leader of the French Socialist faction opposed to Jaurès] at a previous meeting, where we have spoken together in Socialist propaganda, declare that out of thirty-seven million citizens, not more than two hundred thousand individuals had purely capitalist class interests. I have heard Bebel say the same thing. It would be foolish to leave this half-developed democracy to itself. This is why it is necessary that the proletariat with its close organization must make use of all democracy. The "Socialistic Radical" Party of France is neither proletarian nor capitalist, counting among its members the artisans of the small industries and the country workers. This party will accept partial reforms such as secularization, progressive income tax, inheritance tax, and the progressive socialization of mines, insurance, sugar factories, and all monopolistic industries. We do not need to merge ourselves with them, but we would be fools and criminals to reject their co-operation if we may thereby realize possible reforms which would hasten the coming of the new era. (Applause.)

That which leads me to vote against the Dresden resolution is that it appears to me to be an attempt to set forth as a supreme formula of Socialism what is really but a Socialist tradition. To Bebel, Ferri, and Kautsky I will say that it is a singular method of establishing Socialist unity in France to place a weapon in the hands of one of the factions to be used against the other. Above all else, I am opposed to the Dresden resolution because it implies a sort of deep distrust of the proletariat. Its authors seem to fear that the proletariat will compromise itself and lose itself through its collaboration with democracy. The International Socialism which would renovate the entire world and free it from capitalism speaks to the proletariat which it expects to accomplish this as if it were an incompetent minor incapable of directing itself,—a blind man in a strange city. It is as a protest against this position that we oppose the Dresden resolution. It is because it would seek to

limit the diverse activity of the proletariat by narrow rules and bind and injure the working-class where it has the need of the greatest liberty of initiation and activity.

The more mature and stronger the proletariat is in any country the more decisively does it move toward our tactics. Wherever freedom of movement and action rules, there new problems arise. So it is in Italy, where the bourgeois democracy is ready to take new forward steps if Socialism does not neglect to fulfill its political rôle. In England labor organizations are beginning to come to Socialism. Bebel says that it was the reforms of the English bourgeoisie which prevented the adherence of the proletariat [there] to class-conscious Socialism. I think, on the contrary, that class-conscious Socialism has not in its beginning had a sufficiently close contact with labor organizations. It was a misfortune that the Socialist parties were not closely united to the trade-unions at the beginning and that they were so dominated by revolutionary catastrophic theories. Because they stood waiting for a catastrophic revolution the English Socialists have not been able to become a part of the great labor movement. The bond between the proletariat and Socialism is just now growing, but this is because of Socialist political activity in social reforms. In Belgium it is possible to overthrow the Clerical Party within two years if the Liberals and Socialists unite. . . .

When the German Socialists brought this resolution before the International Congress they labored under a fatal illusion because they thought that their national rule might be made to serve as a uniform international regulation adaptable to the internal situation of every country. . . . In seeking to force their Dresden resolution upon us they but communicate to the International Congress the spirit of uncertainty and of hesitation with which they are stricken. You have given to International Socialism a method of action and of systematic organization. You are a great party, and to you belongs the future of Germany. . . . But there is a great contrast between the appearance and the reality of your great force in spite of your electoral success. It is apparent to the eyes of all that this formidable electoral force of yours, valuable as it may be for propaganda, has little effect because you refuse to utilize democratic instruments which are necessary to give it effect. The Dresden resolution will impose upon the whole international movement the rules of inaction and necessity of inaction which it has imposed upon the German

movement, which have taken the instruments for transformation from the German proletariat. . . . They have not conquered universal suffrage and democracy, they have received it from above, and to-day those who gave it threaten to withdraw it. And so it is that you in your "red kingdom" of Saxony may find your universal suffrage taken away from you without a possibility of resistance. . . . You have no revolutionary tradition. You are the only country in the world where Socialism will not be enacted when it secures a majority. You have no true parliamentary régime, for your parliament is, after all, but a plaything in the hands of more powerful forces. You are, therefore, neither parliamentary nor revolutionary Socialists. To be sure, you are large and strong; you have your destiny. Humanity waited upon your Congress at Dresden. At least *Vorwaerts* has proclaimed that the kingdom was yours after the election and that you would convoke the International at Berlin, but the fact is that you are powerless. (Applause.) You have blindly groped hither and thither and concealed your powerlessness of action by taking refuge in theoretical formulas that conceal the political aim. (Applause.) And now you would seek to bind the International with all its forces, all its powers, and make it share your temporary powerlessness, your momentary inactivity.

Where then does your movement encounter opposition? In France, Belgium, England, Switzerland, those countries where democratic life is most intense and most effective, and it is just this fact which proves that your Dresden resolution is a menace to the International.

August Bebel replied, in part, as follows:

The speech which Comrade Jaurès has made to-day would give you the wholly false impression that we German Social Democrats had called forth this debate. Neither before nor since the Dresden Congress have we thought of such a thing for a moment. It is due much more to a fraction of the French comrades who believe that our Dresden resolution should be adopted as the foundation of the tactics of the Social Democrats in all parliamentary ruled countries. . . . The causes that had led us to adopt it in Germany have appeared in a large number of other countries. . . . Events since the Paris Congress of 1900 have shown that, in spite of the unanimous adoption of the Kautsky resolution, these tendencies, these practices have continued to

advance and in many countries have secured an important influence. Therefore, it is doubly desirable to pass judgment on these tendencies. . . .

Jaurès says [the Dresden resolution] belongs only to monarchical Germany. To be sure, Germany is not only one monarchy, it is almost two dozen monarchies. . . . It is a reactionary, feudalistic, police dominated land—one of the worst-ruled countries in Europe. We know this who have to fight this system day after day and who bear the traces of its workings upon our bodies. We do not need anyone from other countries to tell us in what miserable conditions we are. But the facts are such that our resolution may perhaps give the correct tactics to be followed in other countries.

My opinions on monarchy and republic have been frequently given in no unmistakable manner in the bourgeois press. . . . It goes without saying that we are republicans, Socialist republicans, . . . but we do not rush after the bourgeois republic. However much we may envy you French on account of your republic, and however much we may wish it, we do not think it is worth while to let our heads be cracked for it. (Thunderous applause.) Whether bourgeois monarchy or bourgeois republic, both are class states, . . . supporters of the capitalist social order. . . .

Monarchy is not so bad as you paint it, nor the republic so good. Even in our military, agrarian, police Germany we have institutions which would be ideal in comparison with those of your bourgeois republic. Look at the tax legislation in Prussia and other individual states and then look at France. I know of no other country in Europe that has so oppressive, reactionary, exploiting a system of taxation as France. In opposition to this exhausting system with a budget of three and a half billion francs, we at least have a progressive income and property tax.

And so far as concerns the improvement of the laboring-class, the bourgeois republic also utilizes all its forces against the laborer. Where are the laborers used with a more universal and oppressive brutality than in the great bourgeois republic on the other side of the ocean, the ideal of so many of you? In Switzerland also, a far more democratic republic than even France, six times in this last short summer the militia has been used against the laborers who sought to make use of the right of coalition and union through their small strikes. I envy you and your republic, especially on account of the universal suffrage for all repre-

sentative bodies. But I tell you frankly that if we had the suffrage in the same degree and with the same freedom as you, we would have shown you something wholly different (tremendous applause) from what you have yet shown us. . . .

What is your militia to-day other than a most acceptable instrument for the maintenance of class dominion? There has been no great battle in the last four years, either at Lille, Roubaix, Marseilles, Brest, Martinique, or more recently in Normandy, against the striking workers in which the Waldeck-Rousseau-Millerand ministry and the Combes ministry have not used the military against the laborers. In November the Paris police broke into the Parisian labor headquarters in the most shamefully violent manner and wounded and clubbed 70 laborers, and then some of our Socialist friends in the Chamber refused to vote for the punishment of the chief of police. (Hisses.) Jaurès has delivered a lecture to us about what we should do. I will only tell him that if in Germany anyone had thought, for the sake of favoring the Government, of supporting an order of the day which surrendered the most important interest of the proletariat, he would find himself on the next day without any vote (tremendous applause), he would not remain a representative of the people another hour. We are too well disciplined for that.

Jaurès said that the Dresden resolution betrayed a spirit of uncertainty and doubt. I am greatly astonished that so widely cultured and historically correct a man as Comrade Jaurès should make such a statement concerning the Dresden resolution and the German Social Democracy. With the exception of Turkey and Russia we Germans have the worst-ruled government in Europe. But, in spite of that, by means of the universal suffrage in the Reichstag and the corrupted suffrage for the individual states, we have sent a great number of representatives to the legislative bodies of Germany. Have these representatives ever rejected any reform, ever refused to support an advance? Just the contrary. If we have secured the least little bit of political and social advance in Germany, we Social Democrats can ascribe it alone to our account ("Bravo!"). . . . Only by us are they forced and whipped on to reform, and the Social Democrats are so charitable as to accept all concessions that they can wring from their opponents, whenever an advance is actually offered, whether to-day from the Government, to-morrow from the Liberal parties, or the day after from the Center. But in the next hour we will

fight them all, Center, government representatives, and Liberals, as our constant enemies. The bottomless abyss between us and the Government, as well as the bourgeois parties, is not forgotten for a moment. In England, also, the Government grants its reforms only because it would hinder the rise of a powerful Socialist movement. The English bourgeoisie is the shrewdest in the world. ("Hear! hear!"). If in the universal elections next year English Liberalism is victorious it will make one of you [perhaps John Burns] an under state secretary, not in order to advance toward Socialism, but in order . . . to hold the votes of laborers and to avoid Socialism. (Stormy applause from the English delegates.)

What sort of services has Jaurès performed through his alliances? If the republic of France was in danger the last few years [I accept that as a fact], you were wholly right when you worked with the bourgeois defenders of the republic to rescue it. We would have done exactly the same. Neither do we offer you any reproach for your struggle against clericalism. Unite, if you are alone too weak, with the Liberals for this purpose. We would have done the same, but after the battle we are different people.

And where was it during the last few years that Jaurès has rescued the world's peace from danger? We also have *spoken* for the peace of the world, but in contrast to us you *voted* for a military and naval state (the Jaurèsists, "No!"), for a colonial state (Jaurèsists, "No!"), for indirect taxes, for the secret fund (objections among the Jaurèsists), and thereby supported everything that endangered peace. (Loud applause.) We cannot give a vote of confidence to the budget of a capitalist government. (Loud applause.)

Jaurès hopes through this co-operation with capitalist parties to secure the nationalization of railroads and mines. One of the most important points in his program, then, the monarchical Germany has already accomplished. (Merriment.) If we in Germany really wished such an advance we would naturally have also supported the bourgeois parties, but we would have rejected most decisively any permanent alliance with these elements. . . .

I have never heard a more outrageous, contradictory assertion than that the Dresden resolution arose from a spirit of doubt and uncertainty. It was directed at just these doubters and uncertain individuals who sought to corrupt our old and tested tactics. . . .

Jaurès spoke further of the political powerlessness of the

German Social Democracy. What did he expect us to do . . . ? Three million [votes] is not enough for us . . . when we are opposed to a capitalist majority of eight million. . . . To-day we have only the moral weight of a strong minority. . . . Certainly the proposed laws that we support with our votes often find their way into the Government waste-basket. So much the better for our agitation. If reasonable and necessary propositions do not become laws we thereby gain. But, says Jaurès, "as soon as we had received our three million votes the idea was suggested to abolish the Reichstag suffrage." But, Comrade Jaurès, what does that show, except the fright of the bourgeoisie? . . . But what do you think would happen in France if you had two million votes? Do you think your bourgeoisie would look on peacefully? Just wait and see. "Your helplessness arises from the fact that universal suffrage was given to you. You have no revolutionary principles." So says Jaurès. . . . It was not the fighting spirit of the French comrades which gave them the republic, but Bismarck's victory, which forced your captured emperor to give you a republic. That is no disgrace. And in Germany when Bismarck gave us universal suffrage he was obliged to refer it to the revolutionary traditions of 1848 and 1849. That his plan to hold the bourgeoisie back with the help of a little Socialist Party was not carried out is due to the German Social Democracy.

The Millerand episode has now gone by, but the quarrels arising out of it, and which so greatly injured the French Socialist movement, still continue. Concerning this confusion of minds a fine statement was made by Jaurès in the *Cosmopolis* of 1893. (Cries of "Hear! hear!"): "Socialists cannot take power gradually. One must wait until it can all be taken. (Jaurès, 'Very true.') We can co-operate in securing partial reforms, but whoever sets a new life principle as a goal in place of the existing one can only accept the entire power. If we were to take but a part, this influence would be paralyzed by the present social order. The new ideal would not thereby be realized by compromise. We can attain to this in a crisis and cannot come out of it again." ("Hear! hear!") How prophetically, Comrade Jaurès, have you foreseen developments. (Jaurès, "No! no!" Great merriment.) You yourselves have made the worst compromise by your continuous support of Millerand. . . . Millerand did not greet the International Socialist Congress of 1900, but rather made his obeisance before the bloodiest despot in Europe—

the Czar. And when we went to Père La Chaise to honor the murdered Communards by laying a wreath upon their graves, then were we greeted by the infantry, cavalry, and artillery of the Waldeck-Rousseau ministry, and they did everything possible to make an International recognition of the Communards impossible. This one thing should have been enough to have made Millerand for them impossible. (Cheering and applause.) And since then we have seen that in every vote in the French Parliament the Jaurèsist faction has split into two or three divisions, such as is seen in Germany only in the most decadent capitalist party, the National Liberals, and now a fraction of the proletarian party in France offers us this same spectacle, with the natural result that the party is compromised and demoralized. We should vote for the Dresden resolution. I have no fear of the consequences. The French proletariat is not what it is my firm conviction that it is if it does not accept the warning of the Congress. (Tremendous applause followed this speech, and broke out again and again long after Bebel had returned to his place. Countless cheers broke through the sound of hand-clapping and many delegates were on their feet waving their handkerchiefs.)

(See also Part II, Chapter II, "The General Strike.")

The Stuttgart Congress of 1907 is treated in the chapters on Labor Unions and Woman Suffrage, the Copenhagen Congress of 1910 under Co-operation and Unemployment, the proposed Congress to have been held at Vienna in 1915 under The High Cost of Living, Unemployment, and the Drink Question.

VIII. VOTE OF THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST MOVEMENT

1904-1914. COMPILED BY MORRIS ORANS

Country	Socialists first take part in elections	1914	1910	1907	1904
Argentina	1896	48,024	7,006	3,495	1,257
Austria	1893	1,081,441	1,041,948	1,041,948	780,000
Belgium	1894	483,241	483,241	469,094	305,361
Bulgaria	1900	85,489	25,265	13,360	10,652
Canada	1903	17,071	10,929	3,670	2,867
Chile(?)	1903	18,000	18,000	18,000	12,000
Denmark	1872	107,015	98,721	76,566	55,593
Finland	1903	310,503	336,659	329,946	100,000
France	1881	1,106,047	1,106,047	877,999	860,827
Germany	1867	4,238,919	3,259,020	3,259,020	3,010,771
* Greece(?)	—	12,000	34,000
† Great Britain..	1895	529,193	376,645	342,196	100,000
Holland	1880	144,375	83,362	65,743	39,338
Hungary	1902	85,266	80,000	80,000	8,000
Italy	1882	822,280	345,615	326,016	326,016
Luxemburg(?) ..	—	10,000	6,100	4,000	4,000
‡ New Zealand..	1905	9,091	2,521	2,521	91
Norway	1894	124,594	91,268	43,134	24,779
Portugal(?) ...	—	15,000
Roumania	—	2,057	1,557
Russia(?)	1906	300,000	300,000	200,000
Servia	1903	30,000	9,000	3,133	2,508
Spain	1891	40,991	40,991	26,000	23,000
Sweden	1890	172,980	112,293	26,000	10,000
Switzerland	1884	105,012	87,766	64,389	64,389
§ United States..	1888	931,381	641,789	438,509	441,776
Uruguay(?) ...	1910	10,000	80,000
Totals	—	10,739,970	8,599,744	7,414,739	6,183,225

* Where the exact date of elections does not correspond with the periods used in this table, the vote of the last election has been used.

† The vote includes the Labor Party, the Independent Labor Party and the Social Democratic Federation.

‡ Socialist vote. The vote of the Labor Party omitted as not being strictly Socialist.

§ Including the vote of the Socialist Party and the Socialist Labor Party.

INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST MOVEMENT

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT, 1904-1914. COMPILED BY MORRIS ORANS

Country	First Soc. elected in	1914			1904		
		No. of Soc.	Deputies. Total	Pct. Soc.	No. of Soc.	Deputies. Total	Pct. Soc.
Argentina	1904	7	120	5.12	1	120	0.80
Austria	1901	88	516	17.06	10	425	2.29
Belgium	1894	40	186	22.18	30	166	18.07
Bulgaria	1903	22	275	8.06	2	275	0.83
Denmark	1884	32	114	28.08	16	114	14.04
Finland	1904	90	200	45.00	1	200	0.50
France	1885	76	584	13.01	48	587	8.19
Germany	1867	111	397	38.81	81	397	20.38
Great Britain	1894	41	670	6.12	8	670	1.18
Holland	1897	18	100	18.00	7	100	7.00
Italy	1892	63	508	12.45	28	508	5.65
Luxemburg	—	10	53	18.87	5	48	10.42
Norway	1903	24	123	18.70	4	117	3.42
Portugal	1911	1	164	0.65	..	148	..
Russia	1906	17	442	3.82
Servia	1906	2	160	1.25	..	160	..
Spain	1910	1	406	0.25	..	404	..
Sweden	1896	66	230	27.82	4	230	1.81
Switzerland	1892	17	189	8.56	6	145	4.19
Uruguay	1911	1	69	1.33
Totals	—	728	5,223	13.19	265	4,671	5.64

SECTION II

SOCIALISM ON THE CONTINENT OF EUROPE

CHAPTER II

GERMANY

I. THE STRENGTH OF THE SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

THE very rapid growth of the Socialist movement in Germany is indicated by the increasing Socialist vote for members of the Imperial Parliament, or Reichstag:

Year	Popular vote	Percentage total vote	Socialists elected
1871.....	124,655	3.0	2
1874.....	351,952	6.8	10
1877.....	493,288	9.1	13
1878.....	437,158	7.6	9
1881.....	311,961	6.1	13
1884.....	549,990	9.7	24
1887.....	763,128	10.1	11
1890.....	1,427,298	19.7	35
1893.....	1,786,738	23.2	44
1898.....	2,107,076	27.2	56
1903.....	3,010,771	31.7	81
1907.....	3,259,020	28.9	43
1912.....	4,250,329	34.8	110

Two additional Socialist members were elected at special elections in 1913 and 1914. The Reichstag consists of 397 members; the Socialists are already the strongest party in

it, and if they were represented in proportion to their popular vote they would have 138 members.

One of the chief effects of this growth of Socialism in the Reichstag has been to shift the balance of power continually in the Socialist direction. In the elections of 1912, for example, the growth of the Socialist vote put the Reichstag for the first time into the hands of the National Liberals—although the National Liberals had received that year a smaller proportion of the total vote than at the previous election (1907).

RECENT DEVELOPMENT OF POLITICAL PARTIES

The following table shows the change in the complexion of the Reichstag from 1907 to 1912:

Party	Vote 1907	Per cent of total 1907	Vote 1912	Per cent of total 1912	Increase or decrease of vote 1907-1912	Per cent increase or decrease of vote 1907-1912	No. of seats 1907	No. of seats 1912
Social-Democratic....	3,259,029	28.9	4,250,401	3.48	+ 991,372	+ 30	53	110
People's Progressive. (Radical)	1,233,933	10.9	1,497,041	12.3	+ 263,108	+ 21	49	42
National Liberal....	1,630,581	14.5	1,662,670	13.6	+ 32,089	- 2	51	45
Center (Catholic) and Poles	3,633,501	23.4	2,438,487	29.0	- 195,014	- 7	123	108
Conservatives and Imperial Economic Union.....	1,895,192	16.8	1,797,983	14.7	- 197,208	- 10	107	70
Total.....	11,262,829		12,207,259		944,430	8		

(The smaller parties are not included.)

In 1912 the Socialist party membership was 970,112 (839,741 men, 130,371 women). In 1913 the membership rose to 982,850 (841,735 men, 141,115 women).

A special effort was made to get new members in 1914. In a single week in March (The Red Week) 148,000 were obtained. The dues-paying members in the summer of 1914 exceeded 1,080,000, of whom nearly one million are men.

In 1913 the party had 91 daily newspapers and journals with a circulation of 1,800,000. During the Red Week (1914) 82,539 new subscribers were gained.

The German Socialists have 364 "education committees," numerous libraries for men, women, and children, a highly elaborate system for the diffusion of Socialist principles among all classes, and over 12,000 Socialist members of town and village councils.

Some parts of Germany are largely agricultural and backward, others are highly industrialized and advanced. Moreover, many parts of this federal empire enjoy a large measure of autonomy. The relative advance of Socialism in the more industrialized districts, the fact that Socialism has gained three-fourths of all the voters in Hamburg, a majority of those of the whole kingdom of Saxony, and practically half of those of Berlin is peculiarly significant. The following table is of interest:

THE STRENGTH OF SOCIALISM IN HIGHLY INDUSTRIALIZED DISTRICTS (1913)

	Vote in 1907	Per cent of total vote 1907	Vote in 1912	Per cent of total vote 1912	(1913) No. of party members
Kingdom of Saxony..	418,570	48.5	513,216	55.0	159,913
Berlin	291,939	40.6	418,848	49.1	28,842
Hamburg	251,215	66.2	307,762	74.9	118,828
Province of Branden- burg	112,892	60.6	138,343	61.2	61,823

It will be seen that in these instances the Socialist vote does not correspond very closely with Socialist Party mem-

bership—there being, in 1913, in the whole country, about 23 Socialist Party members to each 100 Socialist voters.

It may be of interest to note the occupations of the Social-Democratic members of the Reichstag elected in 1912. By occupation 80 of the 110 were wage-earners; 17 being metal workers, 9 wood workers, 8 cigar makers, 7 printers, 6 shoemakers, 6 tailors, 4 from the building trades, 3 from the textile industry, 2 being transport workers, 2 office employees; and nearly all the other important trades and industrial employments were represented by one member each. Of the 30 remaining members 3 were merchants and 27 were members of the professions, the latter being divided as follows: 8 lawyers, 7 writers, 5 teachers, 4 editors, 1 referendar, 1 ex-officer, 1 preacher (Paul Goehre). The ex-officer was von Vollmar, the leader of the Bavarian Socialists.

In religion, 22 belonged to the established Protestant churches, 17 to other Protestant churches, 4 to the Catholic Church; 7 were Jews. Fifty-eight belonged to no church, 6 of these declaring that they had no religion whatever. Two were non-committal.

II. THE PROGRAM OF THE GERMAN SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY

While the oldest, perhaps, of all the programs of the world's leading Socialist parties, that of Germany is of special significance as being the prototype of nearly all other Socialist Party programs, and as having remained unmodified since its original adoption at Erfurt in 1891. It is as follows:

THE ERFURT PROGRAM

Preamble

The economic development of bourgeois society leads by natural necessity to the downfall of the small industry, whose foundation is formed by the worker's private ownership of his means of production. It separates the worker from his means of production, and converts him into a propertyless proletarian, while the means of production become the monopoly of a relatively small number of capitalists and large landowners.

Hand in hand with this monopolization of the means of production goes the displacement of the dispersed small industries by colossal great industries, the development of the tool into the machine, and a gigantic growth in the productivity of human labor. But all the advantages of this transformation are monopolized by capitalists and large landowners. For the proletariat and the declining intermediate classes—petty bourgeoisie and peasants—it means a growing augmentation of the insecurity of their existence, of misery, oppression, enslavement, debasement, and exploitation.

Ever greater grows the number of proletarians, ever more enormous the army of surplus workers, ever sharper the opposition between exploiters and exploited, ever bitterer the class-war between bourgeoisie and proletariat, which divides modern society into two hostile camps, and is the common hallmark of all industrial countries.

The gulf between the propertied and the propertyless is further widened through the crises, founded in the essence of the capitalistic method of production, which constantly become more comprehensive and more devastating, which elevate general insecurity to the normal condition of society, and which prove that the powers of production of contemporary society have grown beyond measure, and that private ownership of the means of production has become incompatible with their application to their objects and their full development.

Private ownership of the means of production, which was formerly the means of securing to the producer the ownership of his product, has to-day become the means of expropriating peasants, manual workers, and small traders, and enabling the non-workers—capitalists and large landowners—to own the

product of the workers. Only the transformation of capitalistic private ownership of the means of production—the soil, mines, raw materials, tools, machines, and means of transport—into social ownership and the transformation of production of goods for sale into Socialistic production managed for and through society, can bring it about, that the great industry and the steadily growing productive capacity of social labor shall for the hitherto exploited classes be changed from a source of misery and oppression to a source of the highest welfare and of all-round harmonious perfection.

This social transformation means the emancipation not only of the proletariat, but of the whole human race which suffers under the conditions of to-day. But it can only be the work of the working-class, because all the other classes, in spite of mutually conflicting interests, take their stand on the basis of private ownership of the means of production, and have as their common object the preservation of the principles of contemporary society.

The battle of the working-class against capitalistic exploitation is necessarily a political battle. The working-class cannot carry on its economic battles or develop its economic organization without political rights. It cannot effect the passing of the means of production into the ownership of the community without acquiring political power.

To shape this battle of the working-class into a conscious and united effort, and to show it its naturally necessary end, is the object of the Social Democratic Party.

The interests of the working-class are the same in all lands with capitalistic methods of production. With the expansion of world-transport and production for the world-market the state of the workers in any one country becomes constantly more dependent on the state of the workers in other countries. The emancipation of the working-class is thus a task in which the workers of all civilized countries are concerned in a like degree. Conscious of this, the Social Democratic Party of Germany feels and declares itself *one* with the class-conscious workers of all other lands.

The Social Democratic Party of Germany fights thus not for new class-privileges and exceptional rights, but for the abolition of class-domination and of the classes themselves, and for the equal rights and equal obligations of all, without distinction of sex and parentage. Setting out from these views, it combats in

contemporary society not merely the exploitation and oppression of the wage-workers, but every kind of exploitation and oppression, whether directed against a class, a party, a sex, or a race.

Immediate Demands

Setting out from these principles the Social Democratic Party of Germany demands immediately—

1. Universal equal direct suffrage and franchise, with direct ballot, for all members of the empire over twenty years of age, without distinction of sex, for all elections and acts of voting. Proportional representation; and until this is introduced, re-division of the constituencies by law according to the numbers of population. A new legislature every two years. Fixing of elections and acts of voting for a legal holiday. Indemnity for the elected representatives. Removal of every curtailment of political rights except in case of tutelage.

2. Direct legislation by the people by means of the initiative and referendum. Self-determination and self-government of the people in empire, state, province, and commune. Authorities to be elected by the people; to be responsible and bound. Taxes to be voted annually.

3. Education of all to be capable of bearing arms. Armed nation instead of standing army. Decision of war and peace by the representatives of the people. Settlement of all international disputes by the method of arbitration.

4. Abolition of all laws which curtail or suppress the free expression of opinion and the right of association and assembly.

5. Abolition of all laws which are prejudicial to women in their relations to men in public or private law.

6. Declaration that religion is a private matter. Abolition of all contributions from public funds to ecclesiastical and religious objects. Ecclesiastical and religious communities are to be treated as private associations, which manage their affairs quite independently.

7. Secularization of education. Compulsory attendance of public primary schools. No charges to be made for instruction, school requisites, and maintenance, in the public primary schools; nor in the higher educational institutions for those students, male and female, who in virtue of their capacities are considered fit for further training.

8. No charge to be made for the administration of the law, or for legal assistance. Judgment by popularly elected judges. Appeal in criminal cases. Indemnification of innocent persons prosecuted, arrested, or condemned. Abolition of the death penalty.

9. No charges to be made for medical attendance, including midwifery and medicine. No charges to be made for death certificates.

10. Graduated taxes on income and property, to meet all public expenses as far as these are to be covered by taxation. Obligatory self-assessment. A tax on inheritance, graduated according to the size of the inheritance and the degree of kinship. Abolition of all indirect taxes, customs, and other politico-economic measures which sacrifice the interests of the whole community to the interests of a favored minority.

For the protection of the working-class the Social Democratic Party of Germany demands immediately—

1. An effective national and international legislation for the protection of workmen on the following basis:

(a) Fixing of a normal working-day with a maximum of eight hours.

(b) Prohibition of industrial work for children under fourteen years.

(c) Prohibition of night-work, except for such branches of industry as, in accordance with their nature, require night-work, for technical reasons, or reasons of public welfare.

(d) An uninterrupted rest of at least thirty-six hours in every week for every worker.

(e) Prohibition of the truck system.

2. Inspection of all industrial businesses, investigation and regulation of labor relations in town and country by an imperial department of labor, district labor departments, and chambers of labor. Thorough industrial hygiene.

3. Legal equalization of agricultural laborers and domestic servants with industrial workers; removal of the special regulations affecting servants.

4. Assurance of the right of combination.

5. Workmen's insurance to be taken over bodily by the Empire; and the workers to have an influential share in its administration.

6. Separation of the churches and the State.

(a) Suppression of the grant for public worship.

(b) Philosophie or religious associations to be civil persons at law.

7. Revision of sections in the Civil Code concerning marriage and the paternal authority.

(a) Civil equality of the sexes, and of children, whether natural or legitimate.

(b) Revision of the divorce laws, maintaining the husband's liability to support the wife or the children.

(c) Inquiry into paternity to be legalized.

(d) Protective measures in favor of children materially or morally abandoned.

III. THE REICHSTAG ELECTIONS OF 1912

In view of the momentous victory gained by the Socialists in the Reichstag election of 1912, their address to the voters issued just prior to that election is of exceptional interest:

1. ELECTION ADDRESS (WAHLRUF) OF THE GERMAN SOCIAL DEMOCRATS FOR THE REICHSTAG ELECTIONS OF 1912

On the 12th of January, 1912, the general election for the Reichstag takes place. . . . This election will determine whether, in the succeeding years, the policy of oppression and plundering shall be carried still farther, or whether the German people shall finally achieve their rights.

In the Reichstag elections of 1907 the voters were deceived by the Government and the so-called national parties. . . . The Reichstag of the "National" *bloc* from Heydebrand down to Weimar and Naumann has made nugatory the laws pertaining to the rights of coalition; has restricted the use of the non-Germanic languages in public meetings; has virtually robbed the youth of the right of coalition, and has favored every measure for the increase of the army, navy, and colonial exploitation.

The result of their reactionism is an enormous increase of the burdens of taxation. In spite of the fact that in 1906 over 200,000,000 marks increase was voted, in stamp tax, tobacco tax, etc., in spite of the sacred promise of the Government, through its official organ, that no new taxes were being con-

templated, the Government has, through its "financial reforms," increased our burden over five hundred millions.

Liberals and Conservatives were unanimous in declaring that four-fifths of this enormous sum should be raised through an increase in indirect taxes, the greater part of which is collected from laborers, clerks, shopkeepers, artisans, and farmers. Inasmuch as the parties to the Bülow *bloc* could not agree upon the distribution of the property tax and the excise tax, the *bloc* was dissolved and a new coalition appeared—an alliance between the holy ones and the knights (Block der Ritter und der Heiligen). This new *bloc* rescued the distiller from the obligations of an excise tax, defeated the inheritance tax, which would have fallen upon the wealthy, and placed upon the shoulders of the working-people a tax of hundreds of millions, which is paid through the consumption of beer, whisky, tobacco, cigars, coffee, tea—yea, even of matches. This Conservative-Clerical *bloc* further showed its contempt for the working-people in the way it amended the state insurance laws. It robbed the workingman of his rights and denied to mothers and their babes necessary protection and adequate care.

Since that date every by-election for the Reichstag, as well as for the provincial legislatures and municipal councils, has shown remarkable gains in the Social Democratic vote. The reactionaries were consequently frightened, and now they resort to the usual election trick of diverting the attention of the voters from internal affairs to international conditions, and appeal to them under the guise of nationalism.

The Morocco incident gave welcome opportunity for this ruse. At home and abroad the capitalistic war interests and the nationalistic jingoes stirred the animosities of the peoples. They drove their dangerous play so far that even the Chancellor found himself forced to reprimand his *junker* colleagues for using their patriotism for partisan purposes. But the attempt to bolster up the interests of the reactionary parties with our international complications continues in spite of this.

Voters, be on your guard! Remember that on election day you have in your hand the power to choose between peace or war.

The outcome of this election is no less important in its bearing upon internal affairs.

Count Bülow declared, before the election of 1907, "the fewer

the Social Democrats, the greater the social reforms." The opposite is true. The last few years conclusively demonstrate this. The socio-political mills have rattled, but they have produced very little flour.

In order to capture their votes for the "national" candidates, the state employees and officials were promised an increase in their pay. To the high-salaried officials the new Reichstag doled out the increase with spades, to the poorly paid humble employees with spoons. And this increase in pay was counterbalanced by an increase in taxes and the rising cost of living.

To the people the Government refused to give any aid, in spite of their repeated requests for some relief against the constantly increasing prices of the necessities of life. And, while the Chancellor profoundly maintained that the press exaggerated the actual conditions of the rise in prices, the so-called saviors of the middle class—the Center, the Conservatives, the anti-Semites and their following—rejected every proposal of the Social Democrats for relieving the situation, and actually laid the blame for the rise in prices upon their own middle-class tradesmen and manufacturers.

New taxes, high cost of living, denial of justice, increasing danger of war—that is what the Reichstag of 1907, which was ushered in with such high-sounding "national" tom-toms, has brought you. And the day of reckoning is at hand. Voters of Germany, elect a different majority! The stronger you make the Social Democratic representation in the Reichstag, the firmer you anchor the world's peace and your country's welfare!

The Social Democracy seeks the conquest of political power, which is now in the hands of the property classes, and is misused by them to the detriment of the masses. They denounce us as "revolutionists." Foolish phraseology! The bourgeois-capitalistic society is no more eternal than have been the earlier forms of the state and preceding social orders. The present order will be replaced by a higher order, the Socialistic order, for which the Social Democracy is constantly striving. Then the solidarity of all peoples will be accomplished and life will be made more humane for all. The pathway to this new social order is being paved by our capitalistic development, which contains all the germs of the New Order within itself.

For us the duty is prescribed to use every means at hand for

the amelioration of existing evils, and to create conditions that will raise the standard of living of the masses.

Therefore we demand:

1. The democratizing of the community in all of its activities. An open pathway to opportunity. A chance for everyone to develop his aptitudes. Special privileges to none. The right person in the right place.

2. Universal, direct, equal, secret ballot for all persons twenty years of age without distinction of sex, and for all representative legislative bodies. Referendum for setting aside the present unjust election district apportionment and its attendant electoral abuses.

3. A parliamentary government. Responsible ministry. Establishment of a department for the control of foreign affairs. Giving the people's representatives in the Reichstag the power to declare war or maintain peace. Consent of the Reichstag to all state appropriations.

4. Organization of the national defense along democratic lines. Militia service for all able-bodied men. Reducing service in the standing army to the lowest terms consistent with safety. Training youth in the use of arms. Abolition of the privilege of one-year volunteer service. Abolition of all unnecessary expense for uniforms in army and navy.

5. Abolition of "class-justice" and of administrative injustice. Reform of the penal code, along lines of modern culture and jurisprudence. Abolition of all privileges pertaining to the administration of justice.

6. Security to all workingmen, employees, and officials in their right to combine, to meet, and to organize.

7. Establishment of a national department of labor, officials of this department to be elected by the interests represented upon the basis of universal and equal suffrage. Extension of factory inspection by the participation of workingmen and workingwomen in the same. Legalized universal eight-hour day, shortening the hours of labor in industries that are detrimental to health.

8. Reform of industrial insurance, exemption of farm laborers and domestic servants from contributing to insurance funds. Direct election of representatives in the administration of the insurance funds; enlarging the representation of labor on the board of directors; increasing the amounts paid workingmen;

lowering age for old-age pensions from 70 to 65 years; aid to expectant mothers; and free medical attendance.

9. Complete religious freedom. Separation of church and state, and of school and church. No support of any kind, from public funds, for religious purposes.

10. Universal, free schools as the basis of all education. Free text-books. Freedom for art and science.

11. Diminution and ultimate abolition of all indirect taxes, and abolition of all taxes on the necessities of life. Abolition of duties on foodstuffs. Limiting the restrictions upon the importation of cattle, fowl, and meat to the necessary sanitary measures. Reduction in the tariff, especially in those schedules which encourage the development of syndicates and pools, thereby enabling products of German manufacture to be sold cheaper abroad than at home.

12. The support of all measures that tend to develop commerce and trade. Abolition of tax on railway tickets. A stamp tax on bills of lading.

13. A graduated income, property, and inheritance tax; inasmuch as this is the most effective way of dampening the ardor of the rich for a constantly increasing army and navy.

14. Internal improvements and colonization; the transformation of great estates into communal holdings, thereby making possible a greater food supply and a corresponding lowering of prices. The establishment of public farms and agricultural schools. The reclamation of swamp-lands, moors, and dunes. The cessation of foreign colonization now done for the purpose of exploiting foreign peoples for the sake of gain.

Voters of Germany! New naval and military appropriations await you; these will increase the burdens of your taxes by hundreds of millions. As on former occasions, so now, the ruling class will attempt to roll these heavy burdens upon the shoulders of the humble, and thereby increase the burden of existence of the family.

Therefore, let the women, upon whom the burden of the household primarily rests, and who are to-day without political rights, take active part in this work of emancipation and join themselves with determination to our cause, which is also their cause.

Voters of Germany! If you are in accord with these principles, then give your votes on the 12th of January to the Social

Democratic Party. Help prepare the foundations for a new and better state whose motto shall be:

Death to Want and Idleness! Work, Bread, and Justice for all!

Let your battle-cry on election day resound: Long live the Social Democracy!

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC
REPRESENTATIVES IN THE REICHSTAG.

BERLIN, December 5, 1911.

2. SUPPORT OF PROGRESSIVES ON THE SECOND BALLOT

The general election being over, the executive board of the party issued the following public statement, ostensibly designed to govern the action of Socialist voters in casting their second ballots in the by-elections (second ballotings) which were soon to follow:

COMRADES:

The 12th of January has fulfilled our hopes. The working-class of Germany has had a thorough reckoning with the parties of the Conservative and Catholic Alliance. Our party has been wonderfully successful. We have won 65 seats in the general election, received about 4,250,000 votes; we will participate in 121 by-elections.

Let us finish the work that this general election has so gloriously begun. We can win countless numbers by drawing upon our last reserve forces for the second ballots.

In many districts our vote was so small that our candidates do not enter into the by-elections. We must therefore decide whether or not we may support one of the candidates of the other parties.

According to the decision of the Party Congress of Jena, 1911, our comrades may support only such bourgeois candidates as will pledge themselves either in writing or before witnesses:

1. To the support of the existing suffrage rights to the Reichstag.

2. To oppose any infringement upon the right of free assemblage and free organization.

3. To oppose any attempt to increase penal laws for political offenses.

4. To oppose exception laws (*Ausnahmegesetze*) in any form.

5. To oppose the increase of existing import tariffs or the levying of new tariffs on articles necessary for the consumption of the masses.

6. To oppose the increase of existing or the levying of new indirect taxes upon articles necessary to the masses for their consumption.

Should in any one district both candidates pledge themselves to fulfill these conditions, the Liberal candidate is to enjoy the preference over the Conservative. In every other case our supporters are absolutely to refrain from voting.

According to these instructions, with due regard to the personality and record of the candidate in question, the Socialist vote is to be decided.

Now, let us get to work. Let our watchword be:

Down with the Tax-Robbery of the Fusionists!

Down with the Opponents of Free Assemblage.

Down with the Foes of Popular Elections to the Reichstag.

On with the Battle. The last Barricade must be overthrown.

We must do all in our power to drive the nobility, the powers of the church from their strongholds in our government. We must finally and for all time overcome the foes of the progress of the working-class, the opponents of the harmonious development of the German Empire!

Yours for solidarity,

THE EXECUTIVE BOARD.

After the by-elections were over (they had yielded to the Socialists 46 additional seats), in addition to issuing the above public statement, it became known that a confidential circular of very different purport had been sent by the board to party representatives in certain weak districts, designed to render ineffective in those districts certain of the directions conveyed in the public statement. This confidential circular read as follows:

We have entered into a conference with the Progressives concerning mutual support in the by-elections. With the close of the general election, the Progressives found themselves in an unfortunate situation, from their point of view, and there was great danger that they would unite with the parties of the Right. By so doing they would not only have decreased our parliamentary representation but would have rendered futile our attempt to shatter the Conservative and Catholic alliance. Under the circumstances it seemed to us inadvisable to refuse to consult with them. At the same time we emphatically refused to sacrifice any district where we had even a remote chance of electing our candidate by our own strength, or where there was any chance of holding what we had gained in previous elections. We insisted, further, that absolute reciprocity characterize the whole agreement. The Progressives have pledged us their support in certain districts.

We, on the other hand, besides promising the usual support in such districts where we do not participate in the by-elections, according to the mandates of the Jena Congress, made this concession: that we would subdue our agitation in districts in which we could under no circumstances elect our candidate should the Progressives unite with the parties of the Right.

The central committee of the Progressive People's Party will publicly call upon its constituents under no circumstances to vote in favor of a Conservative, a National Party candidate, a candidate of the Center or a member of the *Wirtschaftliche Vereinigung* (a small group of agrarian reactionaries). It will proclaim that political necessity demands the overthrow of the blue and black *bloc*. The Progressive People's Party will further, in a confidential circular to the local committees, call upon them to support our candidate in the first-mentioned districts. We, on the other hand, have promised to hold no meetings, to distribute no leaflets, to hand out no ballots in the above-mentioned 16 districts before the election, not to try to get the voters on election day to the ballot-box. On the other hand, we may distribute ballots on election day in front of the election booths. We are convinced that this agreement serves the best interests of the party and of the general public, and request you, therefore, to inform your district and do all in your power to enforce this agreement under all circumstances.

This secret agreement occasioned widespread dissatisfaction within the party, and much bitter criticism. The matter was carried before the Congress of the party in 1913, where Scheidemann, defending the executive board, said:

Unless we are willing to be used as willing tools of the Conservatives, the subdued campaign carried on in the 16 districts which you so severely criticise was an absolute necessity. In these districts a compact bourgeois majority stood opposed to us. . . .

IV. KAUTSKY AND BERNSTEIN ON THE ELECTIONS

Karl Kautsky, summarizing the results of the election in *The New Review* some months later, wrote:

Apparently the election of 110 Social Democratic deputies has altered nothing. The Government and the majority of the Reichstag are just as reactionary as before, social reform lags as it formerly did, and the rivalry in armaments goes merrily forward. But those who expected that the elections could and would make any change in these respects were pinning their faith to unrealizable illusions. No bourgeois majority, no matter what its composition may be, will ever conduct an energetic struggle against the Government in behalf of a genuine parliamentary régime, against militarism and the increase of the naval forces, and for radical social reforms. Such a struggle can to-day be expected of a Social Democratic majority only. And it was obvious in advance that the majority of 1912 would not be Social Democratic.

The advantage for which we are fighting in an electoral is, above all, a moral one. Our most important duty does not consist merely in enlightening and organizing the proletariat, but also in inspiring it with the consciousness of its own power. If there are still many workers who assume a hesitating, apathetic, or even hostile attitude toward Socialism, this is not because they disapprove of our aim, but because they doubt our power to realize it. To prove that we are a mighty force becomes even

more important than to prove that we are in the right. We succeeded in doing this most brilliantly in the last Reichstag elections. Over 4,250,000 votes and 110 seats in the Reichstag; a third of all the votes cast, and more than a fourth of all the Reichstag seats, Social Democratic—that speaks so clearly and plainly for itself that even the most apathetic understands it and even the most timid is encouraged. It plainly means that the German Social Democracy has ceased to be a mere propaganda party, that it has entered upon the practical struggle for power. . . .

But the election districting favored the agrarian wing and procured for it more seats than the number of its votes warranted. It depended upon the attitude of the Social Democracy in the secondary elections whether or not the agrarian wing was again to win for itself a majority in the Reichstag. . . .

We succeeded in depriving them of this majority. . . . Conservatives and Center combined do not form a majority this time.

Naturally it would have been a delusion to believe that a majority of combined Liberals and Social Democrats would usher in an era of democracy and social reform. The Liberals not only lack the necessary strength and courage, but above all the desire for it. That the latter did not gain a majority signifies a negative, not a positive advantage. . . . It is indeed to be expected that the Government will succeed in bringing the National Liberals and the "Black-Blue Bloc" into one camp. But it can hardly accomplish that without creating rebellion among a considerable portion of the supporters of the National Liberals as well as of the Center. . . .

So long as a Social Democratic majority is not attainable, we are obliged to limit ourselves to preventing the Government from obtaining a safe majority, to depriving it of the power necessary for violent measures against the working-class; and we must strive to place the bourgeois parties in the situations in which they found themselves before the election, either to serve the purpose of the proletariat or to lose their proletarian following. . . .

The high cost of living continues to rise. Class antagonisms are becoming ever more acute. the mass of the population is becoming more and more embittered against existing conditions. And we are making gigantic strides toward the time when we

shall have half of the votes cast, and shortly after that half of the seats in the Reichstag.

Kautsky being the editor of the official party weekly, *Die Neue Zeit*, may be presumed to have expressed in the above article the view of the majority in the German Social Democratic Party. The view of the moderate wing of the party has been expressed as follows—in the *Sozialistische Monatshefte*—in an article by Eduard Bernstein:

Impressive indeed is the demonstration which the January elections have given of the spread of Socialism in Germany. . . . The whole of the increase in the votes polled for all parties, with 47,000 votes beyond, flowed into the party of the working-class. This is the more significant, inasmuch as according to the census of employment only some 60 per cent of the new voters can be counted as working-class voters. . . . The indeterminate voters may be regarded as of steadily decreasing importance in the accumulation of Socialist votes, but they still play a very important part in the distribution of seats. . . . The fight for parliamentary seats is in a high degree a fight for the indeterminate voters. And if these voters must not be reckoned as party gains, they do, none the less, give the party a sort of vote of confidence, for to an extent the non-party elector in the polling booth votes according to his own judgment, and not under pressure from a superior, he votes for the party in which he has the most trust.

The Reichstag elections just concluded, and the position created by them have paved the way for a segregation of groups into two main parties, comparable with the division of the French party groups into opposing camps. . . .

The line of demarcation, which has now brought together on one side the Liberal groups and the Social Democrats, and on the other side the Center (Catholic) and the Conservatives, with the smaller groups of social reactionaries associated with them, leaves still many illogical features. But the division it makes corresponds to a logical divergence of basic principles. What has determined the present line of demarcation is the attitude of the parties to the principle of established authorities in government and society, to clericalism in the state and the school, to

agrarian feudalism, to the reactionary economic demands of the small traders and other forms of corporative legislation, to the three-class franchise, the bureaucratic system, and the right of association among the working-class.

Attempts will be made from many quarters to bring into existence a working majority of National Liberals, Center, and Conservatives. The Government is closely interested in this project. . . . If the bulk of the National Liberals refuse to make common cause with the Conservatives and Clericals, a working agreement between the parties of the Left in the Reichstag in opposition to those of the Right will become inevitable. . . .

The general feeling of the Social Democratic Party is certainly in favor of that being done. It is no easy matter, and demands the suppression of many natural antipathies. But the strongly developed political sense of the German Social Democracy has often before conquered such aversions, so long as it has been clear that no fundamental principle of the party would be compromised or abandoned. This condition must be observed in the present instance also. Without it the agreement would be futile and unworkable, as the party would be lamed by internal strife. But such abandonment of its principles is no more involved in the proposed agreement with the Left parties in the Reichstag than it was in the many agreements which have been made in the course of election fights. The agreement will be arrived at for certain definite purposes, reserving in all else the complete independence of the agreeing parties. No sacrifice of convictions will be offered or demanded. . . .

Vorwaerts and other party organs have mentioned some of the questions which come into consideration—the extension of the rights of the Reichstag, especially the right of interpellation; the reform of parliamentary procedure; the removal of the inequalities of the electoral districts; the establishing of the right of association; opposition to all new or increased indirect taxation; reduction of the food taxes. This is not suggested as even a skeleton program, but as an indication of the class of measure to be fought for. . . .

In the course of time the completion of the division of the Reichstag into two main parties would be of immense assistance to the development of parliamentarianism—it is, indeed, indispensable to it, for without great party coalitions no real system of parliamentary government is attainable. . . .

V. THE SOCIALISTS IN THE REICHSTAG

(Article by George Ledebour in *Die Neue Zeit*)

“The first session of the newly-elected Reichstag closed on May 22, 1912, with a stormy discussion. The hopeful, living idealism of the Socialist movement measured its thought with the aged, decrepit, but still powerful reactionary might of a capitalist society. . . .

“Those who are disappointed because our group of 110 Social Democrats, as the largest party in the Reichstag, could not control the policy of the Government, must have peculiar views concerning the activity of a party which can function only as a party of the minority—110 against 287. . . . That is the proposition that makes it impossible for our party to win even the smallest victory for its Socialist ideals. For in these ideals it stands unalterably opposed to all other parties.

“But they, too, have been sorely disappointed who hoped for an aggressive, progressive fusion of Liberal and Socialist forces, which would enforce radical constitutional reforms, putting aside, for the time being, all fundamental differences which divided them. We soon discovered that the Liberal Party was bound to the other reactionary parties with ties that were far stronger than its radical sympathies for the Socialist movement. Between Social Democrats and Liberals there were possible only temporary agreements on this question. The election by the combined Left of Scheidemann as vice-president proved prophetic for the course of the whole session. The election failed to get the ratification of the Reichstag because the National Liberals at the last moment remembered their duty to the State, to the bureaucracy and the reactionary parties.

“The increased influence of the Social Democracy became evident in a more negative form. We succeeded in nipping in the bud a number of reactionary plans. The grouping of parties in the present Reichstag makes it extremely difficult for the avowed reactionaries, the Conservatives, the Free-Conservatives, and the anti-Semites, to gain a majority for their purposes. In the previous Reichstag they could accomplish this either with the two Liberal parties (the Bülow *bloc*) or with the Center (the Bethmann-Hollweg *bloc*). Both these possibilities are out of the question at present because of the increased strength of the Social Democracy. They must secure a combination which includes not only the Center but also at least the National Liberals, in order to carry out reactionary measures. . . . The Center and its opponents, the National Liberals, in order not to compromise themselves unnecessarily before their constituents, are driving each other into more radical positions. . . . The deciding influence of the Social Democracy became evident on other occasions. . . . Together with the Center and the Polish representatives, the Socialist Party succeeded in repealing the act granting subsidies to officials in districts where there is a large Polish population, who are active in the spread of the German language and German views (*Ostmarkenzulage für Reichsbeamte*). This fruit of the anti-Polish agitation of the Hakatist Society was passed in the last session owing to the cowardly desertion of the Progressives. Our colonial policy, too, was strongly influenced by our Social Democratic representation. It was due to our agitation that the Reichstag, in spite of the vehement opposition of State Secretary Solf, nullified the barbaric prohibition of intermarriage between whites and negroes. . . .

“The Government, and with it the parties of the Right

and the Center, strove to enforce new taxes on articles of general consumption. The liberal parties demanded the introduction of direct taxes. Finally a compromise was effected which provides that for the next two years the increased expenditures shall be covered by a whisky and a sugar tax, but that, after October 1, 1916, a new direct tax shall be introduced. All capitalist parties united upon this motion. The Social Democracy, alone, refused to indorse it. . . . Another bill, which calls for the introduction of an inheritance tax, received the indorsement of the Social Democrats with the understanding that the money thus collected be used to wipe out an already existing indirect tax. As the National Liberals, however, declared, when they voted for the adoption of this measure against the parties of the Right and the Center, that they would prefer a property tax, the realization of an inheritance tax at the present time is exceedingly doubtful.

“Though in the discussion of the military and appropriation bills the sharp contrast between the Socialist and the other parties came out clearly enough, the discussions became even more heated when our representatives attacked the renewed activity of the spirit of absolutism in the German Government. Whenever the fundamental questions of our national life come to the fore, there the unalterable enmity between the party of the proletariat and its capitalist opponents makes itself poignantly felt. The Social Democracy may, temporarily, unite with other parties to insure the passage of individual reforms which lie along the lines of our general movement. But the stronger we become, the more clearly comes the understanding, here as well as there, that in the struggle for our fundamental ideals we stand alone and must fight unaided for their realization.”

VI. THE SOCIALIST PROGRAM IN THE PRUSSIAN ELECTIONS, MAY, 1913

The Social Democracy demands equal, direct adult suffrage in the Diet and in municipal elections.

The Social Democracy demands legislation by one house only, and abolition of the House of Lords (*Herrenhaus*) with its inherited and arbitrary power to rule.

The Social Democracy demands the abolition of the privileges of the nobility which still exist and hinder the free development of the nation.

The Social Democracy demands absolute separation of church and state.

The Social Democracy demands free education and school supplies, the expense to be borne by the nation. Only mental ability should be considered in the choice of pupils for higher schools; free meals for needy school children; abolition of the clerical control of schools.

The Social Democracy demands that all charitable institutions be conducted by the nation.

The Social Democracy demands the abolition of the system of Seigniorities (*Gutsbezirke*) which hinder all cultural development on the one hand and try by every possible trick to dodge the support of their poor. (A *Gutsbezirk* is an agricultural estate having political autonomy, controlled by the owner of the estate.)

The Social Democracy demands increased factory inspection and the employment of workmen as factory inspectors.

The Social Democracy demands a more marked progression of the existing income tax for high incomes, a decrease in the tax upon incomes under 3,000 marks. Abolition of existing indirect state and municipal taxes.

The Social Democracy demands the improvement of the care of public health by the nationalization of the whole medical profession, as well as the drug and medicine industries.

The Social Democracy demands a decrease of prison labor and the employment of prisoners for state and road improvements.

The Social Democracy demands increased wages and salaries for laborers, employees, and the lower officials in national industries (railroads, forestry, mines).

The Social Democracy demands the extension and improve-

ment of our railroad system; a decrease in the rates for second and third-class cars, and the eventual introduction of zone or district rates (*Zonentarif*).

The Social Democracy demands the building of streets, bridges, and water-works by the nation.

The Social Democracy demands abolition of the existing exception laws concerning servants and domestics. (*Gesindeordnung*).

The Social Democracy demands the right of national employment and the right of laborers to organize.

The Social Democracy demands a liberal and modern revision and reform of the Prussian mining laws, aside from its demand for national mining legislation.

The Social Democracy demands that all superfluous expenditures be avoided, such as are incurred to-day for purposes of representation by the Prussian nobility.

The Social Democracy demands the employment of workmen as associate judges (*Schoeffen*) and jurymen; the payment of fees for the performance of such duties.

VII. THE SOCIALIST PARTY CONGRESS OF 1913

At this congress (1913) a new majority was made up of the Center and the moderates against the radicals. Thus for the first time in the history of the party the radicals were defeated and the moderates were victorious. The moderates not only won by majorities of more than two to one on the military and taxation issue, on the general strike issue, but also elected their candidates to all important party offices. The resolution and the discussion on the military question are given in Mr. Walling's *The Socialists and the War*. We present in later chapters brief summaries and abstracts indicating the attitude of the Congress toward the problem of the high cost of living, unemployment, taxation, and the general strike.

VIII. THE REPUBLICAN DEMONSTRATION IN THE REICHSTAG,
JUNE, 1914

Less than two months before the outbreak of the war, on the last day of the last Reichstag session preceding the great conflict, occurred one of the most important events in the history of the German Party. The Reichstag sessions are closed by standing cheers for the Kaiser. The custom of the Socialist members has been to absent themselves in a body. On this occasion they decided—though only after a long discussion and a close vote (51 to 47)—to take a more positive stand. In remaining seated they committed an act which would be a crime, *lèse-majesté*, if done outside the Reichstag. Our documents are illustrative of the discussions which this action aroused in the party.

1. CHILDISH, FAR TOO CHILDISH

(Editorial in *Vorwaerts* [Berlin], June 5, 1914)

That the Socialists remained seated during the cheers for the Kaiser may not have pleased the Liberals, but it cannot be contested that it was their good right to act as they did.

But what shall be said of the fact that there are party comrades . . . who hardly differ in their arguments from the Liberal press? That Edmund Fischer is among these party comrades does not astonish us. . . . He looks at politics from the standpoint of the trader who wishes to come to terms with his creditors. Any kind of settlement seems a gain to him. . . . No further argument is necessary for this sort of politics. . . .

It is more regrettable that Comrade Wolfgang Heine also speaks against the demonstration in the Reichstag. His principal argument is one of civic law. He does not deny that the Government in the Empire and in Prussia carries on a spiteful policy against us and treats us as if we stood outside of the law. He says:

“But it is against the fundamentals of a modern parliamentarist state to hold the emperor personally responsible for

the policy of the Government. . . . If we make the emperor responsible for all politics, that is an acknowledgment of the thing we oppose. . . . The battle-cry 'for or against the emperor' . . . has always been used against us with good success by the reactionaries. It is our task to keep the person of the monarch out of all political struggles. The Socialist Reichstag group, by its recent behavior, has drawn his person into a struggle of this kind and has given its opponents the right to do the same."

Since when has it been Socialistic policy to take fiction for reality? . . . Is monarchical power lessened when ignored? or [rather] when opposed?

Of what civic law does Heine speak? Of one explained to suit his wishes, not of a real one. For the real civic laws give the monarch in Germany and Prussia a power which exists in no other state, excepting Russia. And this power to-day stands at the disposal of the opponents of the working-class. Not because our opponents cleverly identify Government with the person of the monarch, but because the monarchy has become the means of their class rule. And should we leave the basis of the German constitutional misery untouched and pass it by, pretending to be deaf and blind, merely because Heine fears the inciting of the monarchists could be harmful to us in some politically backward regions?

The principle of keeping the person of the monarch out of all political discussions is understandable for countries like England, with purely parliamentary governments, but it is a danger for the political development of semi-absolutist countries like Germany. It is bad enough that the Liberal press fails to understand this, but it is beyond comprehension how a Socialist like Heine can blow the same horn and talk of the lack of respect of the Socialist group towards the Reichstag. No, if we have to talk of lack of respect—though a fighting party like ours cannot give or obtain much respect—it should be of the want of respect shown to the convictions of the largest party of the German people. We consider it a presumption and an intolerable coercion to try to force us to participate in a demonstration which is against our convictions. The angry howls of the reactionaries show us how right we were in our action and how important Byzantinism is to them as a support of their rule. The conduct of our group during the cheers for the Kaiser

would not be so important had it not caused all this uproar. Under these conditions it may become the means of carrying our convictions regarding the development of the constitution to the furthest circles, increasing the interest in our fight for the establishment of a democratic constitution. Let the Liberal press continue to do the work of its opponents, that will not keep us from continuing our work of enlightenment with increased intensity.

Let our Liberals wail aloud in their political nursery, which they never seem able to outgrow, we are big and strong enough to stand this. The result of the demonstration does credit to those who advised it.

2. A QUESTION OF HOMAGE

(Editorial in the *Muenchener Post* [moderate Socialist]; quoted in *Vorwaerts*, June 6, 1914)

It is said that the Socialist Party offended the monarchical feeling of the other members of Parliament, remaining seated when the rest of the members arose to show their respect to the emperor. We permit ourselves to remark (apart from the consideration of the feelings of the 111 comrades) that we do not believe in the genuineness of these monarchical sentiments which only exist as long as they coincide with the business interests of the ruling classes. We also do not believe in them because historical experience proves that these inherited sentiments leave no trace behind when the political system changes.

More important is the objection that we in particular—from our own point of view—have no cause to demonstrate against the person of the monarch. Of course the refusal to give homage is naturally not meant against “the person.” But the bearer of the Crown (considered impersonally) is not immaterial under the present German political system. It would of course be different had we the parliamentary system; then it would indeed be ridiculous and obtrusive to strike, by such action, the entirely irresponsible representative of a country. But in Germany the monarch selects his government, no politics are carried on without him, and against his wish no law can be passed, no administrative measure concluded. The bearer of the Crown is, under present conditions, actually responsible for the entire politics of the country. He is responsible for the fact that a third of the German population is treated as having no rights. This is our

position: it is not to be expected that a large party should participate in an act of homage so long as the Crown really bears the responsibility for a policy of oppression and persecution of this party. Only when the German monarchs decide to elect governments which will respect the equality of all subjects of the state—only when they withdraw and remain neutral towards all parties—that is, reign in a really parliamentary way—will anti-monarchical demonstrations be discontinued.

3. KAISERISM

(From Wolfgang Heine's reply to his critics, as published in *Vorwaerts*, July 2, 1914)

The ballot in its bearing upon the decision in the Socialist Reichstag group has already been discussed upon several occasions. Fifty voted for and 47 against remaining seated [during the cheers for the Kaiser]. Later on 2 more positive and 8 more negative votes were added, making the final total 52 for and 55 against the group, at the time having an enrollment of 110 members. Even if all three of the uncast votes had been considered as being in favor of remaining seated, contrary to all parliamentary practice, this faction would still have been in the minority.

From the accentuation of the republican character of the party, contrary to the opinion of the *Leipzig Volkszeitung*, no actual benefit will result. The republic is, indeed, an ideal state form, the only one, in fact, which may rationally be established, and thousands of things which we endure in Germany because of the monarchical type of government are not even encountered in the republic. But we must express rational ideas in a rational way, not with manifestations utterly inconsistent with rational thought.

Besides, the chance of establishing a republic in the German Empire at present or in the near future is so beyond the bounds of possibility as to render absurd any effort to assign it as the goal of our present policy. There are no longer any German Social Democrats who still believe that the task confronting us to-day is the forcible overthrow of our present form of government; and yet this would necessarily be a presupposition in con-

nection with the formation of the German republic. No, the party has different goals and tasks before it, tasks more near at hand and more practically conceivable in view of prevalent economic conditions and our present political power. Work in behalf of these aims is now most important.

.

(See—for the position of the German Socialists on other questions—chapters on “The High Cost of Living,” “Unemployment,” “Taxation,” “The General Strike,” and “Government Ownership.”)

CHAPTER III

FRANCE

I. INTRODUCTORY

By the elections of 1914 the French Socialist Party—or, as it is officially named, the French Section of the Workingmen's International—secured one-sixth of the total vote of the country and one-sixth of the members of the Chamber of Deputies (101 members). By this it became the second most important Socialist movement in the world, being exceeded only by that of Germany. Nor can its influence be gauged entirely by its votes, for it has given rise to semi-Socialistic groups, such as the Independent Socialists, represented by the present Premier Viviani. It has also given the country several ministers in former cabinets, such as Briand and Millerand, and finally it has tinged with its views on present-day politics the governing party in the country, the so-called Socialistic Radicals.

The following (from the *Appeal to Reason*) gives an idea of the growth of the Socialist movement:

“There was some Socialist organization in France before 1870, but the suppression of the Commune in 1871 broke it up and led to the death or exile of the leaders. In 1877 the paper *L'Égalité* was founded to advocate the principles of Karl Marx and its program was adopted in 1879 at a trade-union congress at Marseilles which adopted the name of ‘Socialist Labor.’ The party was unsuccessful at the election of 1881, and a few years later it was split up into five divisions. At the election of 1893, 40 Socialist

deputies were elected by a popular vote of nearly half a million. At the general election of 1906, 54 Socialists were elected by a vote of 877,999. In 1910 the party grew to 76 and the poll to 1,125,877. The party has since been reduced to 71, but the diminution is only apparent, for there are also, in the French Chamber, small groups of 'Independent Socialists' and 'Republican Socialists,' as well as over 200 Radical Socialists who sympathize more or less with the ultimate aims of Socialism. In reality the France of 1914 is more Socialistic even than Germany, although its forces are not concentrated into a great centralized machine. It shades off on one side into syndicalism and anarchism, and on the other side into radicalism. At the municipal elections of 1912, the number of communes captured by the Socialists was 282, while 5,530 Socialists were elected."

II. ELECTORAL TACTICS, 1914

1. RESOLUTION OF THE ELECTIONS OF 1914 *

Precisely because it is a party of incessant combat, the Socialist Party takes present developments and events into account. To-day as ever it is able to distinguish among the capitalist parties those which are most threatening to the working-class and to Socialism. It knows who have been the accomplices of Radicalism in the Moroccan venture, who have been the defaulters in the struggle against the three years' law.

But above all it abhors and denounces nationalism, imperialism, and militarism, which by their reactionary conceptions and cut-and-dried policy disorganize the defensive forces of the country, dissipate the spirit of sacrifice and the citizens' desire for independence, insult both the people and the army by putting them in opposition to one another, burden production, unbalance the budgets, fatally increase taxes, dry up the resources of social reform, and deflect to sterile and profitless expenditure

* This resolution was unanimously adopted by the Congress.

the thousands of millions needed for the works of civilization that have been abandoned.

It detests and denounces, above all, this reactionary nationalism, which is already a peril, and which, if it gets the mastery, will create war, will crush the working-class, and exile and massacre its militants.

It knows also the danger which menaces it in Briandism, the strike-breaker, father of the three years' law, double-faced accomplice of the most retrograde militarism, parody of political organization which combines in one fusion ticket all the powers of reaction conspiring against democracy and the proletariat. The Socialist Party knows that to-day, as yesterday, it stands alone in an uncompromising struggle for the guaranty of French independence and international peace by means of the organization of "an armed nation" [militia].

In fighting the three years' law it is fighting not only an absurd and disastrous law, but it is fighting all the political policy of ignorance, of reaction, of brutality, of which it is the effect and the symbol.

Responding to the appeal of the International at Basle, in the effort begun at Berne, it wishes to go to the very root of European antagonisms in contributing its share to the common task of the proletariat of all countries and in working for that Franco-German "rapprochement" which will permit of the definite alliance of France, England, and Germany, a necessary condition for the peace of the world.

The Socialist Party pledges itself to electoral reform and the passage of proportional representation, and will give its efforts to this end all the more as it is a preparation for the constitutional revision and because it lessens the power of the reactionary Senate which has been and is so hostile to the workers.

It is in this spirit, with the strength of all its political and social claims, that the Socialist Party goes into the battle.

On the first ballot it will have in each department its candidate as bearer of its propaganda, of its entire doctrine, of its complete program.

And on the second ballot, continuing the first, it will contribute all its strength to laying low the militarist reaction. Recognizing no allegiance except to the cause of the proletariat and to Socialism, but not separating itself from the republic, from anticlericalism, and from peace, wherever it has no direct chance of

victory, it will give its co-operation freely to the candidates of the two other parties in proportion to the vigor and thoroughness of their fight against the three years' law, against war, against jingoism, against the military and clerical coalition.

It is to its responsible [branch] Federations that it refers with confidence the task of best determining the Socialist and the republican interest.

2. DISCUSSION OF THE PARTY CONGRESS

(January 25-29, 1913)

The representative of the Federation of Drôme introduced a resolution providing for independent action in the first election, and that, in the second election, Socialists could support, if necessary, those radicals who pledged themselves to vote against the three-years' service law, and who were in favor of lay schools and tax reform.

Compère-Morel declared that the Socialists must pursue independent action and refuse any fusion either with reactionaries or radicals. He favored a direct program of the re-establishment of the two-years' law, the adoption of the income and property tax, the protection of lay schools, and the revision of the constitution, together with the abolition of the Senate. As regards the second election, there were two possibilities of action. It was possible, he declared, to follow the resolution of Châlons, which permitted each federation to make an independent decision concerning its action during the second election, or to allow the national council to decide the matter. He favored independent action of each federation, as it would permit elasticity and adaptability. He attacked the proposal of Hervé, who had advocated a fusion with the radicals in order to obtain a victory on the question of militarism. Compère-Morel said that the autonomy of the local federations should be limited by a declaration by the general

body announcing the dangers of combinations with other parties.

Vaillant also opposed fusion. He proposed that the administrative commission should issue a proclamation before the elections which would appeal to the people themselves, and would show that the party was not only the party of the workers but the promoter of all progress. The second election does not differ greatly from the first, he declared, and the Socialist propaganda should also be used in the latter. The national council should have the control over complicated cases.

Hervé made the point that militarism was the great issue, and that effectually to oppose this it was necessary that there should be a coalition of the parties of the Left. Hervé said that he did not propose fusion but merely a *bloc*, in order that those parties who were united on this issue might act in a united manner and bring pressure to bear on the government that otherwise would be lacking. He read the resolution of the Paris Congress of 1900, which permitted co-operation with bourgeois parties in exceptional cases, and said that such an exceptional case was then present. The Radical Left and the Socialists were really united on three demands: 1, opposition to the return to the three years' military service; 2, tax reform; 3, lay schools and an anti-clerical policy. Hervé closed by saying that the Radical Party could not govern alone, and that if a Socialist did not support it, it would be compelled to seek help from the conservative and reactionary Right and would then continue to compromise the Republic.

Albert Thomas opposed Compère-Morel's idea that general principles only should be advanced at the first election and that in the second election propaganda should be restricted to certain immediate demands. Thomas believed that, to have efficient propaganda, one must advance cer-

tain actual problems, such as the military situation in the first election. If the situation concerning militarism was as extraordinary as Hervé claimed, then he too would believe in fusion; but no such situation existed.

Jaurès declared that the discussion showed that the question of fusion was non-existent. Once before they had allied themselves with a fraction of the bourgeoisie in order to gain the ends of secularization, which was consistent with revolutionary tradition. Yet the government (Briand's) that resulted from it was weak in its unity and the overthrow of Briand was greeted with such joy by the Socialists that his successors were actually popular for a short time. Now we are in the midst of a social war, he declared, with such economic problems at stake that no revolutionary tradition can make united action possible.

Jaurès then took up the question of electoral reform and declared that, though this was still important, nevertheless the war in the Balkans, which caused the growth in both nationalism and militarism, had pushed this issue back in relative importance. Electoral reform was necessary, but the way of attainment was not to be found through a coalition of parties differing from the Socialists on basic general principles.

Jaurès said there was really only one election: the first. If the Socialist propaganda was carried on clearly and powerfully in this election, an impression would be made upon those who did not vote for the Socialist candidate at the first election. The second election, he declared, was only a continuation of the first. Hervé said that the Socialists of France had theory on one side, while he proposed action on the other. Jaurès declared that theory and action were not separated and that neither was possible without the other. He pointed to the splendid record of the party, to the fact that it was the only party which

had the courage to oppose the colonial policy of France, and was the first to recognize the reactionary effect of the Moroccan adventure upon the domestic and foreign politics of the country. Jaurès declared that the power of international Socialism was the reason for the strength of its fight against militarism.

Jaurès concluded:

Many resigned themselves to the three years' service law because they believed that the increased term was the only protection against invasion. But the Socialists would say to the people: "Your willingness for sacrifice has been misused; those in power could not find a new international procedure, and indeed they did not wish to, because they use the army as a weapon against domestic enemies." (Stormy applause.)

The deficit is so terrible that the bourgeois politicians are afraid to handle it. If it is necessary to raise a billion [francs] each year, the tax reform which has been promised for 30 years will probably be carried through, not to aid the farmer, not for social reform nor to better the educational system, but to cover the immense debt caused by militarism. If we show all this to the people, they will realize the effect of the three years' system and will understand that it will only increase the struggle of the nations. They will realize that Socialism alone, which unites all nations, is capable of guaranteeing unarmed peace and civilization. And when we have shown the people this solution we shall in our struggle untangle all questions such as electoral reform, the revision of the constitution, and protection from the Senate. If all this is done in a first election, and if we have candidates with this program all over France, I am not anxious about the way in which we give our support and second election to other parties. The division of seats will be accomplished easily under the stimulus of the first election. How can you waver in your choice if it comes to that between a militaristic Clerical and a Radical who stands for the two years' service law? Recruiting work for Socialism is only possible when we do our republican duty. We should declare, although not setting up an exclusive compulsory clause: first, all fusions are prohibited which would bring Socialist votes to a militaristic reactionary; second, the Socialists should support those Republicans

who are opposed to the three years' service and who favor the lay school system. A central committee should decide exceptional cases, so that the party might not be hindered in the reforms which it advocates.

3. ELECTION MANIFESTO OF THE SOCIALIST PARTY

We are not only a party of social transformation. We wish to give to the world of labor greater possibilities of carrying on the struggle, thus preparing it for the great work of social renovation which is incumbent upon it. We want to obtain, to seize, the maximum of political and social reforms obtainable under the present social system:

Solid organization of national defense by means of an immediate return to the two years' law, and the progressive substitution of a militia for the barracks army.

Pacific external policy, extending the present narrow system of alliance by a Franco-German *rapprochement*.

Development of public instruction by all possible resources.

Organization of the democracy by means of proportional representation and the revision of the constitution.

Fiscal justice by the taxation of incomes and of capital.

A complete system of social insurance against old age, accidents, sickness, and unemployment.

Freedom to organize for all, including officials.

III. THE ELECTIONS OF 1914

1. THE RESULTS

At the first ballot (April 26) the Socialists elected 40 members of the Chamber of Deputies, instead of 29 at the former first ballot. That is, in 40 out of 602 constituencies, the Socialists had a majority over all other parties together.

At the second ballot, the Socialists, supported by the unified Radicals and independent voters, secured 61 more seats. But the Socialists gave the Radicals almost exactly an equivalent vote. So that the total number of seats won

(101) is almost exactly the number to which the Socialists would be entitled under proportional representation. For the vote obtained, 1,400,000, is one-sixth of the total vote (8,329,000), just as the seats won are one-sixth of the total number of seats.

The growth of the vote and of the number of Socialist members of the Chamber is shown in the following table:

Year	Votes	Members of Chamber
1906.....	878,000	54
1910.....	1,110,000	76
1914.....	1,400,000	101

The following table shows the number of seats in the Chamber of Deputies held by the various parties since 1902:

Parties	1902	1906	1910	1914
Monarchists and Nationalists.....	121	100	86	68
Progressists and Republicans of the Left	178	141	149	146
Radicals and Socialistic Radicals....	242	230	260	208
Independent Socialists	12	20	32	29
Socialists	37	54	76	101

This table shows the growth of the parties to a degree tinged with Socialism. By adding together the first two party groups, we note the steady decrease of the conservative members of the Chamber from 299, to 241, to 235, and finally to 214. At the same time, if we add to the Socialists the Independents, who claim to be Socialists, we see a steady and corresponding increase of the extreme Radicals from 49 to 74, to 108, and finally to 130. (Figures taken from *Le Radical*, official organ of the Radicals.)

In the previous Chamber, that of 1910, the Socialists had lost 9 members during the session, mostly through

desertions. These and other former Socialist deserters were either defeated, like Zevaes and Allemane, or lost a large number of votes, like Briand and Millerand.

The Socialist vote rose more rapidly in certain agricultural sections than in most industrial centers. In 9 agricultural departments (out of a total of 87 departments) the Socialist vote increased by 191,000 votes—or two-thirds of the total Socialist increase in the nation. The percentage increase is still more disproportionate, as the population in these provinces is scanty. As will be seen from the following figures, these provinces now lead the country in their Socialism: Allier and Haute-Vienne, both being agricultural:

Of every 1,000 registered electors 123 voted Socialist, as against 98 in 1910, 642 for the various other parties [677 in 1910], while 235 did not go to the polls [225 in 1910]. In 32 departments the Socialist vote is less than 5 per cent [in 1910 there were 48], also in 32 departments the Socialist vote exceeds 10 per cent [25 in 1910]. The heaviest Socialist vote was cast in the following departments: Haute-Vienne, 37.3 per cent; Allier, 33.5 per cent [where we lost two seats]; Ardennes, 30.3 per cent; Nord, 29.1 per cent; Seine, 25 per cent, and Pas-de-Calais, 23.2 per cent. In the South the party has done well in purely agricultural districts, viz.: Var, 28.2 per cent; Gard, 22.5 per cent; Hérault, 19.7 per cent; also in the central department: Cher, 25.7 per cent; Nièvre, Yonne, etc., where there are great numbers of small farmers working their farms on sharing terms with the landlords [métayer system].

These are percentages of the total vote registered, not of the total vote cast. Partly on account of the agitation of certain labor union leaders and other syndicalists abstentions were larger than ever, having risen according to the Berlin *Vorwaerts* from 225 per thousand in 1910 to 235 per thousand in 1914 (nearly twice the Socialist vote). It was to this cause that *Vorwaerts* attributes the defeat

of the well-known conservative Socialist Rouanet. In his district 8,000 of the 27,000 voters failed to vote.

Though the Socialists elected 40 members by a majority of *those voting*, they nowhere had a majority of the voters, according to *Vorwaerts*—a fact it accounts for as follows:

This is explained, in the first place, by the composition of the population, the numerous groups of middling and small property owners. Even if the peasants are at all accessible to our propaganda, at the very best they offer greater difficulties than an industrial population. In the second place one must not undervalue the importance of those other parties which in regard to freedom and democracy are decidedly radical, and still live up to the traditions of the Revolution.

The middle-class problems that confront the French Socialist Party are also indicated by the occupations of its members in the Chamber. In sharp contrast with the Socialist group in the German Reichstag, only a little more than half are wage-earners—against nearly three-fourths in Germany. They are divided as follows:

55 Wage-earners.	4 Merchants.
6 Farmers.	9 Professors, etc.
5 Teachers.	6 Lawyers.
6 Doctors and Apothecaries.	1 Engineer.
10 Journalists.	

2. AFTER THE VICTORY

(Editorial by Jean Jaurès in *L'Humanité*. Reprinted in the *Vorwaerts*, May 17, 1914)

The victory is the outcome of the new industrial advance of France and its economic development, which is taking place intensively and rapidly all over the country. In this manner we have conquered the five new election districts which were created through the duplication of the old, where the population had increased on account of the growth of industry. Another cause of the growth of Socialism is the awakening of the republican

democracy, which was deeply injured by the reactionary and dubious policies of the bourgeois politicians. The Socialists were the first to fight these politicians.

The electoral successes of our party, even those in the second election, were not the results of an artificial combination [with other parties]. It is true that the failure of the most advanced Radicals was in our favor, but in a number of election districts our votes helped the Radicals to election. The trend towards the Left, which showed itself all over the republican country, would not have been so noticeable had the Socialists not made their strength felt in 420 election districts.

It is a fact that the number of our seats tallies exactly with the number of our votes. The 102 Socialist deputies represent a sixth of the House, just as the 1,400,000 Socialist votes represent a sixth of the voters who had gone to the polls. We are now sure that we have to work only to strengthen and develop our organization in order to be certain of the victories already realized, and to prepare in large measures for new conquests. The "libertarian" philosophy still exists in a few minds, but the sentiment that could be called negative anarchism is about to disappear. The best-known adherents of abstention from voting, its apostles in fact, have participated in the election struggle, publicly and officially. They declared that it was necessary to make use of the ballot on account of the military reaction. The syndicalists greeted the victories of the Socialists as a "victory of civilization." The proletariat, encouraged by the victories already gained, believes that the gates of the future are open. It knows that we almost obtained a victory in 50 additional election districts, and it is beginning now to count on the possibility of capturing the Government and of placing the political power at the service of the working-class. As soon as the Socialists have broken the barriers of the Senate, which even to-day only retards the movement, instead of bringing it to a standstill, we will become the guiding power of the republic.

The proletariat knows this well, and this alone is an event in our democracy of the greatest political and moral importance. What increases its importance is the fact that the peasants of France are beginning to come into the Socialist Party. They are passionate democrats and resist violently all clerical interference; they further detest the armament policies and are indignant about the difficulties with which the military reaction burdens

them. On the other hand, they are becoming more and more convinced that national independence, which they have much at heart, finds its best guarantee in the organization of the armed nation. They further have to fight capitalism in the form of middlemen. As their narrow individualism is beginning to be undermined by the practice of the co-operative system, they are entirely prepared to enter into the democratic and republican Socialist Party, and the day will come when they will join the masses of industrial workers under the flag of the social republic.

Of course this will not come about without long and patient effort. We are not blind to the difficulties of the future nor to those of the present. In the beginning of July we will have a parliamentary situation of extreme complications to contend with. We will have to realize the fiscal, social, and military reforms which are contained in the latest decision of universal suffrage—in a very immature and embryonic state. At the same time we shall have to avoid any sign of confusion, any modification of the distinctive characteristics of our party. This task does not overtax the strength of French Socialism, for it has reached a sufficient stage of organization. But it will frequently be very difficult. More than once we shall have to pass through phases where the true motives of our actions will first not be evident. It will be necessary that our comrades from the International Bureau put their faith in us. But the movement is strong, the party healthy and as far removed from any kind of verbal radicalism as it is from compromise. It would be too early at present to draw up our plan of action. This plan will be discussed by our members of Parliament as soon as the Chamber assembles. But we hope to be able to render good service to social progress as well as to world peace, in which the German-French “*rapprochement*” is an essential condition.

(See also chapters on “Agriculture,” “Unemployment,” “The High Cost of Living,” “The Drink Question,” “The Labor Unions,” “Militarism,” “Municipal Socialism.”)

CHAPTER IV

BELGIUM

I. INTRODUCTORY

It is impossible to show accurately the recent growth of the Belgian Socialist Party either in membership or in the number of votes obtained. The votes may be gauged roughly, however, by the number of seats obtained in the Chamber of Deputies:

In 1900.....	33	Socialist deputies
" 1902.....	34	" "
" 1904.....	28	" "
" 1906.....	30	" "
" 1908.....	34	" "
" 1910.....	35	" "
" 1912.....	39	" "
" 1914.....	40	" "

In 1900 the Chamber had a total of 166 members; it now has 186.

The increase of the Socialist vote cannot be shown because of amalgamation with the Liberals in a number of districts in 1912. The election of 1914, however, indicated a gain of nearly 10 per cent for the combined opposition, while the Catholics lost 5 per cent. As the Socialists maintained their candidates in the latter election, their vote could be reckoned separately and was considerably more than half of the opposition. It was also calculated that the majority of the voters had become oppositional, although only half of the country had an election in this year. Owing, however, to the inequality of election districts, each

Catholic had less than 14,000 votes and each opposition candidate more than 16,000. The Catholics preserved their control of the Chamber—though losing their majority. (The votes referred to are still plural votes—as explained below under the caption General Strike.)

It is impossible to give the party membership, because members of Socialist trade-unions and co-operative are reckoned together with members of purely political organizations. In 1913, for example, there were 270,000 members of the three kinds of organizations, but less than 16,000 or 5.6 per cent of these were members of political groups. While having some advantages, this system also has its disadvantages and is now being remodeled. While the close relation between Socialist unions and the Socialist Party is to be maintained, the latter is to have a more or less separate organization, more similar than at present to other countries (see below).

If we judge the growth of Socialism by that of the Socialist unions, this growth has been especially rapid of late. The following statement concerning this development was made by the Belgian leader, Vandervelde (in *The Metropolitan Magazine*) :

The great bulk of the union men who recognize the class struggle are affiliated with the Union Commission, whose rapidly increasing strength is shown by the following figures :

	Members
In 1905.....	34,000
In 1910.....	69,000
In 1911.....	77,000
In 1912.....	116,000
In 1913.....	131,000

If one takes into account the whole number of industrial workers of the country—1,200,000 men, women, and children, of whom it might be possible to organize 800,000—the percentage

of organized working-people with Socialistic tendencies is still too small.

The sudden increase of membership in 1912 was due to preparation for the general strike for equal suffrage in 1913, and the increase in the latter year within a few months after the strike is another evidence of its popularity and success among the working-classes. From 1908 to 1911, when the union movement was chiefly economic, its growth had been very slow.

II. THE ELECTION OF 1914

(From *Vorwaerts*)

“The elections of 1912, as is known, were ‘fusion elections.’ The Liberals and Socialists together were to take political clericalism by storm. The result is remembered: the desertion of the moderate and floating elements of Liberalism to the clerical government; M. de Broqueville returned to Parliament with 16 majority instead of 6 as previously. These experiences have brought this advantage that they allowed principles and interests to come into clear expression again in an election—in which, for Socialists at least, it is a question not only of a political program, but equally of the visibility of principles and ideals. A number of election meetings in which Liberals and Socialists came into serious conflict and even to blows, allowed the opposition between the two parties to be seen in all its acuteness, and the speeches on both sides, robbed of their fusion glamour, appeared before the voters in the guise of pure class conflict.

“The abandonment of the fusion policy, of course, has in no way lessened the intensity of the electoral struggle against clericalism and the clerical majority—certainly not in the Socialist, and scarcely in the Liberal camp.

“Though the election covered only one-half the country, the Government’s majority fell from 16 to 12. The Socialists gained 1 and the Liberal opposition, 3 votes. The gain in opposition votes has already been referred to.

“The election means a condemnation of the tax-policy of the scandalous and ruinous waste of the majority, its costly militarism, and above all, of the very school law upon which the majority based its hopes of success and of increased strength.

“In their calculation of success, the clericals also relied confidently upon the issue of the general strike. The clerical organs claimed incessantly that the general strike was the cause of the economic crisis! But this plot also failed.

“The election has borne out absolutely the view of those who opposed the Liberal-Socialist fusion policy at the time of its enforcement, on the ground that it would damage both of the allies, without accomplishing its purpose—the overthrow of the clerical majority. This time there was common action of the two parties in two instances only. At the same time both parties gained votes in nearly every constituency.”

The manifesto of the Labor Party (the Socialist Party) after the elections thus commented on the election results:

The head of the Cabinet himself [de Broqueville] said: “There is but one normal, regular way to bring about any change in the very practical situation that confronts us: the body of electors must speak . . . and then, if the electoral body declares itself, there will be an exact indication for every loyal person to follow.”

Well, the electors have given that indication this 20th of May in a striking manner.

The figures of the election show that if the results of 1912 and 1914 are added together, the three opposition parties which

had an equal suffrage for their platform obtained 1,327,887 votes against 1,321,848 votes for the government candidates.

It is not only the actual majority of the country, it is the legal majority, the majority of plural votes which condemns the plurality system. . . .

III. REORGANIZATION OF THE PARTY

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON REORGANIZATION BEFORE THE PARTY CONGRESS OF 1914

[It will be seen from these extracts that it is proposed to take the party from the control of the labor unions and to give it a more or less independent political organization, more like most other Socialist parties]:

The project proposes two kinds of organizations which can be affiliated with the Labor Party, and defines their functions as follows: (a) political organizations, (b) economic organizations.

The purpose of this change is to bring about the creation of organizations specifically devoted to political propaganda, the need of which is being more and more felt. (See Introductory to "Belgium" above.)

By specific political propaganda we mean the systematic distribution of Socialist publications, propaganda through the press, the sale of pamphlets, the organization of political meetings and lectures. . . .

Members who are especially interested in political questions ought to have an organization where they can discuss and develop their general knowledge along that line. Up to the present, with only few exceptions practically, the political propaganda has been carried on either by a central committee composed of delegates from all the various groups of the party and having its headquarters in the commune, or by a single one of these groups, a labor union, a co-operative society, or a mutual benefit association.

We certainly ought to confess that, although this situation was satisfactory and gave good results until recent years, this is no longer the case, and at present we must perfect our organizations if we wish to maintain and improve the positions gained. While, on the one side, the need for a permanent form of action is

becoming greater and greater from the political standpoint, our economic organizations are more and more absorbed in their own affairs and cannot guarantee a sufficient political propaganda except to the detriment of their own activities. . . .

[The commission, while demanding a certain degree of separation between party and unions, nevertheless recommended that the unions be permitted to continue to act "within the party," which gave rise to the following discussion] :

Comrade Vandersmissen, representing the commission appointed last year, has the floor. He declares: "Our present party statutes are, for the most part, over twenty years old; the trade-unions are losing their local character more and more. They are beginning to extend over large industrial centers. They are no longer in a position to carry on political propaganda. The same thing can be said of the co-operative associations. The concentration of co-operatives is advancing. It is impossible to develop political activity in communal territories without a special [political] organization. Political action is necessary. The financial resources of the party must be increased. More and more is demanded of the national council of the party. We can no longer depend on extraordinary and voluntary contributions." As to representation at the yearly congress, Vandersmissen demands that not groups, but federations, should have the right of representation.

Brouckère speaks at length on the method of organization in Germany, England, France, and Italy. He speaks against the proposed system of party cards. This would lead to a sort of plural vote. It would keep out the non-union men. Those who cannot be organized in trade-unions must be allowed to pay their dues to one of the political groups.

Brouckère proposes the following resolution:

The Congress authorizes the general council of the party to lay before the next congress an outline of the statutes in a form that will embody proposals made at this congress. Comrade Vandersmissen accepts this proposal.

(See also "The General Strike" and "Education.")

CHAPTER V

ITALY

I. INTRODUCTORY

THE greatest turning-point in the history of the Italian Socialist Party occurred in 1912 when four of its members in the Chamber of Deputies—including its most noted orator, Bissolati, and the editor of *L'Asino*, Podrecca—were expelled from the party because of their compromising attitude on the war in Tripoli (see below). Sixteen of the 39 Socialists in the Chamber then formed a new Reformist Party—which has grown both in membership and in representatives in the Chamber, but less rapidly than the regular or revolutionary party.

The growth of the party before the split—on account of internal friction and the struggle with the Syndicalists—had become somewhat discouraging. It was as follows:

1900.....	19,000	members
1902.....	37,000	"
1904.....	45,000	"
1908.....	40,000	"
1910.....	30,000	"
1912.....	25,000	"

Immediately after the split an improvement began, though it must be attributed in part to the enthusiasm aroused by the first election under an approximately equal manhood suffrage.

From the official report in 1914 it appeared that since July, 1912, when the Reformist Socialists (group Bissolati)

were compelled to leave the party, the membership had steadily increased from 28,689 (July, 1912) to 30,936 (December, 1912), 37,000 (December, 1913), and stood at over 49,000. In 1913 the percentage of the total vote going to the regular party rose from 10 to approximately 21 per cent, in spite of the fact that the new party received over 4 per cent of the total vote.

The increase of the vote of the whole party is as follows:

Year	Votes	Deputies
1892.....	26,000	6
1900.....	175,000	32
1904.....	320,000	27
1909.....	339,000	40
1913.....	1,160,000	72 (out of 508)

The large number of deputies elected in 1900 was due partly to a fusion with the Radicals. In 1913 the vote and representation in the Chamber of Deputies were divided between two Socialist parties, the increased vote being partly due to the extended suffrage.

The attitude of the party toward the war may be understood from the following declaration:

II. DECLARATION OF THE SOCIALIST PARTY UPON THE WAR IN TRIPOLI

Workers! At this moment the Socialist Party reminds you that the colonial war, which was prepared with unparalleled astuteness by a band of pirates of high finance, has had for champions all the Italian bourgeoisie, from the Clerical to the Democrat, driven by nationalist madness. We ask that those who desired this terrible war should suffer its consequences now. The workers who have already paid for the foreign insanity a far too heavy tribute in victims and in blood should prepare at once to ask for an account at the time of the electoral fight from those who are responsible for the horrors of war. The Socialist Party, faithful to the ideal of the international proletariat, calls on

the laboring class of Italy to fulfill their sacred task and demand a rendering of accounts.

III. THE SPLIT IN THE PARTY

Although the attitude of the majority of the party toward the war was an uncompromising one, nevertheless there was an important minority that wished to temporize on the ground that it was inopportune, while the country was at war, to abide by the decisions of the majority. This division of opinion became serious.

At the Party Congress in July, 1912, a motion to expel the four opportunist deputies, Bissolati, Bonomi, Cabrini, and Podrecca, was carried by a vote of 12,556 against 9,883, with 2,072 abstaining.

The Socialist Party proper, in order to make their general attitude clear, adopted the following statement, proposed by Lerda:

The Congress, after discussion as to the proper program and tactics for the party in the political elections:

First of all, reaffirms the fundamental doctrine of the class struggle as the theoretical basis and practical guide for all Socialist action; and

Considers that the Socialist Party cannot but be, on account of its essentially revolutionary character, a party of agitation and education, never a government party, and proclaims that for the logical continuity and fighting efficiency of the party it is absolutely necessary to put an end to the system of local autonomy by intrusting to the executive committee [*la Direzione*] elected by the Congress the interpretation and the execution of the decisions of the Congress; and

Declares it to be incompatible with the principles, the methods, and the ultimate aims of Socialism, that those persons should remain in the party who accept Socialist participation in power, or who share the conception of the new Social Democracy [that looks to the collaboration of classes in political-economic matters] and have approved the present military-colonial undertaking; and

Declares that all support to the schemes of the Government is opposed to the fundamental theories of Socialism and to the interests of the proletariat, and claims for the party the right to exact from all its members, including deputies, a strict observance of the decisions of the Congress; and

Reaffirming the anti-monarchical character of the party, lays it down that, in the coming political elections, the method of no compromise [*il metodo intransigente*] must be followed, as the logical and necessary corollary from the theory and practice of the class struggle, which does not permit solidarity of interest between the ruling class and the servant class; and, in consequence, decides to have in the coming elections in every electoral district its own candidacies, of persons who have been regularly inscribed in the party for at least five years, giving permission to the executive committee to authorize the sections to take part in ballotings for candidates of other parties; and

Resolves to shape the electoral propaganda according to purely Socialist principles, but pledges its own candidates to strive in Parliament for that program of reforms which the proletariat in its economic organizations desires and claims.

The expelled deputies and their adherents formed a new party, the Socialist Reformist Party, whose principles were formulated by Bonomi, at a congress held in December, 1913, as follows:

Reforms should be formulated in relation to the economic and political forces of the working-classes and of the forces opposed to them. The party adheres to the proletarian International, and assumes the task of educating the people in the feeling of solidarity, but not without taking into account, for the sake of the defense of the national whole, the actual conditions of international life, with the hope that the success of the working-class movements in the greater states of the world will make possible a general, simultaneous disarmament. We have no prejudice against the democratic parties; whether we are to keep clear of those parties or to adopt a policy of alliance will depend on whether or not the respective programs are similar. An accord in a common opposition, or in support of an accepted measure of the Government, shall be made or revoked according to circumstances; and it is understood that in the laboring-class

those categories are also included which do not come under the head of wage-earners but approximate to the type of the little working-class proprietors.

IV. THE ELECTIONS OF 1913

1. ELECTORAL TACTICS

In 1913 the elections were held under the enlarged franchise, and many questions of how best to approach the new voters were discussed and settled.

a. The Action of the Executive Committee

At a meeting of the executive committee of the party, July 16, the following electoral platform was adopted:

The executive committee of the Italian Socialist Party, having considered the coming electoral struggle,

Confirms and reasserts the tactics and the policy of no compromise whatever adopted by the Congress at Reggio Emilia, and by the former meetings of the executive committee, and

Decides to use the period of electioneering first of all to lay before the millions of proletarians called on to vote, for the first time, the whole Socialist program in its methods and in its aims, explaining the value and the part of parliamentary action in the whole work of the Socialist Party, in order not to deceive the masses nor to let them be deceived; and

Holds that the coming parliamentary Socialist action, to which we ask popular adherence, must set forth, besides a resolute and continual affirmation of Socialist principles,

(1) A firm and systematic opposition to the policy of colonial ventures and military budgets;

(2) A customs policy frankly free trade, especially in view of the renewal of the commercial treaties, and in strict opposition to industrial and agrarian protectionism;

(3) Social legislation that shall not consist only in partial and ephemeral reforms, but shall resolutely deal with the more serious problems of the industrial and agricultural life of the proletariat;

(4) A policy of taxation and expropriation that shall serve to fill the deficit caused by the war, throwing the whole burden

on the capitalistic classes, and that shall permit the destination of a thousand millions of lire to provide means for the social projects we demand; and

(5) An educational policy that shall give to the new generations of the proletariat the means and methods of obtaining a large, modern culture, releasing it from illiteracy.

b. *The Second Ballot*

(From *Vorwaerts'* Report after the First Ballot had been taken)

“The Socialist Party called upon its members to support those candidates who took a stand against the Tripoli war and pledged themselves in writing to stand against the increase of military burdens. The resolution of the party executive mentioned these candidates by name. Among them are three Republicans. The Socialists also supported the Reformist Socialists, with the sole exception of Ferri, who could not be considered. Finally the party executive demanded the support of the Liberal Pinchia, who wrote a book against the war, and of Prince Caetani, who voted against annexation. By a bare majority the executive also favored the support of the former Socialist, Labriola, in Naples.

“The Reformist Socialists supported the Socialists in every instance; the Republicans abstained from voting where there was a Socialist candidate; the Radicals, nowhere supported by the Socialists, everywhere gave the Socialists their support.”

2. ELECTORAL MANIFESTO OF THE SOCIALIST PARTY

Electors of Italy!

The events of the last two years have demonstrated that it is vain to hope from the Government parties a relief from the evils of our present social life.

While, in face of the development of capitalistic civilization, Socialistic aspirations towards the régime of justice and equality

have become the only hope of all the exploited laborers in our country, war, the execrable war of conquest, before which all bow down, has upset, by the insatiable exigencies of militarism, the proposals of better things and of civil progress that you proclaimed five years ago. War has devastated all our national life; in politics it has given the predominance to the régime of the sword, to the omnipotence of the police, to the encroachment of the church; in economics it has increased the high cost of food, the low rate of wages, chronic lack of employment, the difficulty of business; everywhere it has sown sorrow, tears, and sacrifice.

The Government statement for the dissolution of the Chamber may extol the fiscal absorption of the finances of the state as an index of national prosperity, but it ought to acknowledge the neglect of public hygiene, the increase of juvenile delinquency, the persistence of illiteracy, the hopeless condition of the peasants of southern Italy, and the fact that social conflicts become sharper and more widely extended.

The enlargement of the suffrage has multiplied your strength and you have greater power at your disposition to defend your rights, your liberties, your lives and those of your families. Make use of such power to refuse your vote to all those parties and to all those candidates who move in the orbit of the state and its institutions; keep it for our party, which alone has declared a wish to fight against war, against militarism, against the reaction, whether lay or ecclesiastical, of the present political régime.

Fellow workmen!

Parliaments are the instruments *par excellence* of bourgeois dominion: we send to them our political representatives, not for the purpose of co-operating with the class that lives by exploiting labor and accumulating capital, but in order to maintain in the face of the nation the interests and the aspirations of the proletarian class. For this reason our candidates do not present to you a program of illusory, homeopathic reforms—the constitutional opposition promises 30 centesimi [6 cents] pension to old and crippled laborers—but they assert the necessity of a systematic continuous legislative struggle against armaments, against protectionism, against the parasitical classes of the state and of the church, for expropriation by taxation, for a greater conquest of proletarian rights, for universal suffrage of men and women. . . .

3. THE SITUATION BEFORE THE ELECTIONS OF 1913

(From *The New Statesman*)

“The number of parliamentary electors has been increased from 3,247,000 to 8,635,000. The third reading [of the bill to increase the number of electors] was carried by 284 to 62 in a Chamber of 508 deputies.

“The Clericals were generally regarded as likely to profit by it, and it has been widely suggested that it was part of the price which the Government had to pay for clerical support in the Tripoli war; but though the increase of the electorate may be an electoral advantage for the moment, it is doubtful whether the Vatican regards it with real favor.

“To understand the situation one should remember that the unification of Italy was the work of the Liberal bourgeoisie of the towns. In the country districts the peasantry could not be trusted with a vote. It was therefore a political necessity in the early days of Italian unity to restrict the suffrage, and this was effected to some extent by a number of small property qualifications, but far more drastically by a really strict educational test.

“As an educational test is often recommended by politicians of a certain school, it may be well to note its results in Italy, where . . . it was introduced not to strengthen but to preclude reaction. With equal electoral districts based on population, the restricted suffrage produced startling differences in the number of electors in the various constituencies. In prosperous urban or semi-urban districts in the North the number of electors may have been three or four times as great as in the rural constituencies in the center and South, and the difference between town and country was further aggravated by the Papal injunc-

tion to Catholics not to vote, which was far more effective in rural districts. In the great mass of constituencies the independent electors were far too few to defeat the government candidate, backed by the disciplined army of low-paid government officials, carefully trained by the Prefect, upon whom they depended for a career. . . .

“This explains the absence of strong political parties based on ideals and principles, and the degradation of political life. The fate of governments did not depend on outside public opinion, but on their power to control the elected deputies, upon whom the arts of political corruption had to be freely exercised. There was another serious result, in that every government has in the end to pay some attention to public opinion, and as the only public opinion which could make itself heard was that of the North, successive governments have been compelled to have regard in their fiscal legislation mainly to the interests of the North, always the richest portion of Italy and the least in want of government assistance. This is the explanation of the high import duties to protect the industries and such agricultural produce as is peculiar to the North, e.g., the grain of the Lombard Venetian plain and the beet-sugar of the Emilia; and the southern agriculturist is only just beginning to understand why he has to pay such high prices for his agricultural machinery, and why he is unable to buy the cheap sugar which would enable him to utilize the fruit crops on which he mainly depends.

“The political problem of Italy is to combine in the same principles of administration the wealthy progressive North and the destitute and stagnant South. . . .

“In considering the electoral prospects of the various parties, not always clearly defined, we find that the last Chamber consisted of 19 Republicans, 37 Socialists, 54 Radicals, and 420 so-called Constitutionalists. The Repub-

licans and Socialists may be regarded as in permanent opposition to the Government. They appeal mainly to the lower middle-class and the literate artisans of the town. The Republicans are a dying group with a creed sadly lacking in actuality, and they are not likely to increase their numbers. The Socialists have a future, and may in time convert the new electorate; but while they alone of all parties have a program they are very divided as to the methods of attaining it, and their very uncertain attitude towards the war will not help them. The Radicals are usually in opposition to the Government, but support it when its measures are opposed by the more conservative groups of Constitutionalists. They have no real program, and are difficult to distinguish from the more advanced Constitutionalists, except in that they are more markedly tinged with anti-clericalism. The Constitutionalists comprise a number of heterogeneous elements, some few Conservatives usually in opposition to the Government, some thirty Clericals, and forty more who, though not Clericals in name, are quite aware that they owe their election mainly to clerical support. The remainder can usually be relied on to support the Government. The system of government is that of parliamentary bargaining, in which Giolitti, the outstanding personality in Italian politics, is an adept.

“The Clericals prefer to call themselves Catholics, but that terminology conveys the wholly fallacious impression that they alone are practicing Catholics. On the other hand, the term Clerical does not mean that they are in favor of the restoration of the temporal power, and outside Rome, where the conditions are peculiar, there are very few Clericals who desire it. They have ideals and enthusiasm, but no program. As a rule they support Giolitti, and in many cases will obtain government support at the polls.

“The Government boast that they have no program, but

rely upon their record, and they have some grounds for doing so. The war was immensely popular, and having regard only to national considerations it at last welded the country into a nation and made the extension of the suffrage a safe policy. Apart from the administration of the war the Government can point to a long list of democratic and social measures, the extension of the suffrage, the introduction of a more humane penal code, the abolition of the hateful *domicilio coatto*, the state purchase of the railways, the unification, under Government control, of the maritime services, the transfer to the state of life insurance, and a great number of measures dealing with public health, education, afforestation, and local government generally. Though the credit may not be wholly his, Giolitti can point out that since he became the virtual ruler of Italy some twelve years ago there has been, in spite of an unprecedented earthquake and a war, an extraordinary increase of prosperity. Flourishing industries have in the interval been firmly established and the value of agricultural land in the North has nearly doubled, and though the South has not kept pace, it nevertheless shows substantial improvements in all directions."

4. THE RESULTS

The elections were held under the new election law that gave the vote to the overwhelming majority of male adults instead of restricting it to less than one-half, as in the elections of 1909.

According to the new electoral law of 1912-13, practically all adult male Italians were given the right to vote at parliamentary elections. More specifically, this right of suffrage may now be exercised by three classes of citizens: (1) all literate male Italians who are 21 years old; (2)

illiterates who have reached the age of 30; (3) all who have served in the Italian army or navy, even though they have not attained the age of 21. Thus the number of possible voters has been increased from less than 3,500,000 to more than 8,500,000—an addition of over 5,000,000 illiterates.

However, only a little more than half the total vote was cast, that is, less than 4,500,000. Besides the usual motives for abstention,—inertia and indecision,—a considerable part of the non-voters were undoubtedly wage-earners reached by the widespread Syndicalist agitation in favor of a Socialist revolution by other means—by the general strike or insurrection.

The Socialist vote is best measured—both on account of the new suffrage and because of the widespread abstention—by relative instead of by absolute figures. In 1909 the vote was 339,000. In 1913 the combined vote of the two parties which had been formed out of the old was 960,000 for the regular party and 200,000 for the reformists. In 1909 the Socialists had received only about 10 per cent of the total vote cast. In 1913 they received approximately 25 per cent.

In 1909 the Socialists elected 40 out of 508 members of the Chamber. In 1913 they elected 72. Of these 51 were regulars (formerly 24) and 21 were reformists (formerly 16). In the face of this the increase of the reactionary or Clerical members from 20 to 33 has comparatively little significance, especially as it was accompanied by a similar increase of anti-clerical members, counting the Socialists.

The Socialists, moreover, elected 36 members on the first ballot, i.e., without Radical, Independent, or Reform Socialist support. The Reformist Socialists elected 3 on the first ballot.

5. COMMENTS ON THE SOCIALIST SUCCESS

a. *From Article by Oda Olberg (Rome) in Die Neue Zeit*

“The success of our party in this election was a pleasant surprise after our rather pessimistic expectations. Nevertheless there are only very few cases that could be spoken of as a leap forward.

“In the old Chamber of Deputies there were 8 Socialists from the Piedmont, in the new, 11, the vote having increased, in round numbers, from 86,000 to 150,000. Lombardy increased from 3 to 7 deputies (65,000 to 160,000); Venice, from 1 deputy to 4, 2 from districts which were once before in our possession (30,000 to 88,000 votes); Liguria, from 1 to 2 (19,000 to 36,000 votes); the Emilia and the Romagna, from 8 to 16 (62,000 to 155,000 votes). Upper Italy, therefore, in increasing its representation from 20 to 40 deputies, has grown in strength in about the same proportion as the country as a whole. In middle Italy, Tuscany had the largest increase, from 2 to 7 deputies (34,000 to 99,000 votes), the Marches held their 1 deputy (14,000 to 30,000 votes), while Latium lost its 1 Socialist representative (from 7,500 to 36,000 votes). Southern Italy and the Islands, where hitherto no Socialist had ever been elected, sent 4 Socialist deputies to the new Chamber. These seats were won in Naples, in Gallipoli (Apulia), in Torre Annunciata, the manufacturing suburb of Naples, and in Iglesias, the center of the lead industry in Sardinia. The vote in southern Italy shows an increase from 22,000 to 74,000. In the three districts last mentioned our party had polled a large number of votes in past elections.

“Our success was doubtless due to the new election procedure rather than to any broadening of election laws.

This new system of voting, which was looked upon, at first, with such great suspicion, has, as a matter of fact, given the popular vote a secrecy that was hitherto out of the question.

“It is, however, far from my purpose to deny that the new election laws have given a wider and deeper significance to the Italian Socialist movement. It has fired the party to an unprecedented pitch of enthusiasm, and inspired thousands upon thousands of meetings in which the Socialist message was carried out to the most forsaken hamlets of the nation. But the reward for this agitation will come to us only in future years.”

b. *Berlin Vorwaerts—Correspondence*

“The disagreeable surprises for the bourgeoisie connected with this election fight will not end with the 52 Socialist delegates that have been elected to the new house. Besides this number of the official party, 3 other Socialists were elected, namely Ciccotti, Altobelli, and Vigna (Labriola does not rank as Socialist or Syndicalist); also 2 Syndicalists, de Ambris in Parma and Arca in Calabria. The number of Reformists has grown from 15 to 23, an unpleasant surprise for the Government, because of election districts newly won by the Reformists in Sicily and southern Italy. Upon the whole, the Government realizes with astonishment that the new voters consider matters from different angles to those from which the old voters did.

“It must be understood that our party suffered losses also; the loss of the first Roman election district was most bitter and serious—bitter in so far as the district was won by a Clerical Nationalist, after it had been imagined for years that the Clericals in Rome were of no significance as a political power. Hand in hand with nationalism we see

the workers of the Vatican appear upon the horizon. The loss is serious because a Clerical Nationalist was also elected in the fourth district and the two losses defeated the famous "bloc," the anti-clerical administration of Rome. The municipal administration of the capital will now be given to a royal commissioner. After seven years of anti-clerical rule in Rome one does not care to see the Clericals again take hold of public affairs.

"The elections will further show retirements in municipal administrations in other large cities, especially in Turin and Milan, where our party won three out of the six mandates. In both towns the city council has retired already."

V. PARLIAMENTARY POLICY (1913-1914)

1. RESOLUTION OF PARLIAMENTARY GROUP AFTER THE ELECTION

The Socialist parliamentary group at the reunion of its members, conscious of its power and of the duties that come to it from the great affirmation of Socialism made by the proletariat of Italy in the political elections, in spite of the violent acts of the Government, especially in the South, in spite of the corrupt practices done and tolerated in many election districts;

Renews its unconditional adherence to the program of immediate action which the Socialist Party proclaimed during the election, condemning unreservedly the accursed Libian Affair, laying stress upon opposition to military expenditures, denouncing protectionist parasitism, and urging its abolition as speedily as possible;

Declares itself firmly decided to set forth its work of uncompromising opposition, and agitation of social and political problems in Parliament and in the country, without suffering itself to be deceived by the usual promises with which the discourse by the Crown will be larded nor by the stratagems with which Giovanni Giolitti will continue his policy of dissolving the opposition;

And finally asserts that this line of conduct, inspired by its

office of champion of the class struggle, will never induce it to confound its own specific activity with that of any other parliamentary group whatever.

2. RESOLUTION UPON THE RESIGNATION OF THE GIOLITTI MINISTRY

Considering that the political situation, created by the Giolittian coalition of all the bourgeois parties in the last general election, continues in the present government which rests substantially on the same majority, to subserve the same interests; and that

In face of the financial consequences of the war, till now concealed from the country, and of the imposition of militarism, irreconcilable with the growing needs of civilization, the proper mission of the Socialist Party is more than ever that delineated by the necessities of the defense of the proletariat, threatened to-day as it was yesterday by blood-sucking taxation and by the increase of the internal public debts which takes capital away from productive investment and brings back an economic crisis, lack of employment for workmen, and emigration; and that

The silence of the Government upon the necessity of gradually reducing protectionism, proves that the present ministry is bound ever to the same plutocratic coalition; and that

These tendencies are confirmed by the maintenance of the financial provisions proposed by the preceding cabinet, while the masked threats to the liberty of economic action of the railway employees, and the insufficiency of the pledges of social legislation, demonstrate the opposition of the Government to the most urgent claims of the laboring-classes as well as its ill-concealed reactionary spirit;

The parliamentary group determines to persist energetically in opposition to the Government and to the majority, an opposition that should never serve the prearranged views of an insincere democracy.

VI. PARTY CONGRESS OF 1914

The Party Congress was held at Ancona in April; the resolutions proposed on the subjects of protectionism and militarism were passed as a matter of course, but the policy

as to Freemasons and tactics in municipal elections was discussed with spirit and revealed considerable difference of opinion.

1. FREEMASONRY

Mussolini recommended the expulsion of the Freemasons. He said, that "even if the party lost many members through this action, this should not be a cause for worry. Socialism is only a problem of mankind inasmuch as the proletariat is the largest part of mankind. The Socialist in the freemason lodge suffers a change, just as an animal changes its skin in a cellar." (Applause.)

"Under the present mistrust," Lerda declared, "it is impossible to live in the party. But it must not be forgotten that reality demands its right: to-day the Masons are expelled, to-morrow the university men, etc., always in the service of an abstract idea, in the striving for absolute purity. The intention may be good, but the question is, will the results serve the cause of the proletarian?" Lerda in closing his speech pointed out the various functions of the party and explained that the Socialist conviction does not depend on a membership card of the party.

The resolution passed was:

The Congress invites comrades who are in the Masonic Order to end all relations with that institution; and

Declares that it is incompatible for Socialists to enter and remain in the Masonic Order, and invites the section to expel those comrades who will not make their future conduct conform to the rules here laid down.

The vote was: for expulsion, 27,378; for making a demand to withdraw, 2,296; for the motion which stated that this question does not concern the party, 2,485; and for the alliance of freemasonry and party, 1,819.

2. AFTERMATH OF THE CONGRESS

(From several *Vorwaerts* dispatches)

“The Executive Committee of the Italian Socialist Party has requested the deputies Raimondo, Senape, Lucci, and Sandulli, who stood and were elected as party candidates in San Remo, Gallipoli, Naples, and Torre Annunziata (near Naples), to resign. These deputies have refused to comply with the resolutions of the Ancona Congress. Raimondo and Senape, both being Freemasons, have not left the order, whilst Lucci and Sandulli have acted against the resolution on independent tactics in the municipal elections. All four have therefore been expelled from the party, but have retained their seats. The executive cannot, of course, compel them to resign, but evidently wishes to test the feeling in the constituencies.

“The decision of the party Congress of Ancona, which prohibited the conclusion of electoral alliances in municipal elections has, up to the present (May 16, 1914), caused the following branches either to leave the party or to announce that they would refuse to obey its decisions: Naples, Torre Annunziata, Caserta, Rivaroco, Legure, and 20 branches in Piacenza.

“Furthermore, the following branches have refused to obey the decision of the Congress to exclude Freemasons: San Remo, Voltri, Ria, and Crevari. In all these places the party executive will proceed forthwith to found new branches.

“In explaining its reason for seceding from the party, the Naples branch agreed in principle with the non-compromise policy, but said that conditions in Naples and in southern Italy generally were so peculiar that it would not be possible to do any satisfactory work for Socialism

and for the interest of the working-classes on the basis of the Ancona resolution forbidding alliances with non-Socialist groups and persons. The resolution concluded with an expression of hope that it would be possible later to rejoin the party.

“The Socialist member for Gallipoli will also probably leave the party on account of the vote of the Congress on freemasonry. This vote and the measures to be taken have been before the parliamentary group, which has discussed it at two meetings. It was finally decided that the parliamentary group had no power of expulsion, and that only the branch to which a member belonged had power to act in this matter. The members of Parliament who are Freemasons were therefore requested to make this known to their branches. It is stated that 14 of the Socialist parliamentary group are Freemasons, but that 12 of them would leave the order rather than the party.”

(See also chapters on “Municipal Socialism,” “Tariffs,” “The General Strike,” “Militarism.”)

CHAPTER VI

RUSSIA AND FINLAND

RUSSIA

I. INTRODUCTORY

RUSSIA has three distinct and flourishing movements of a Socialistic character. Delegates from the Social Revolutionary and Social Democratic parties are always present at the International Socialist Congresses and the sessions of the International Socialist Bureau. At international meetings of the Socialist members of Parliament representatives of a third movement, the Labor Party, were also admitted, and this movement is classed as Socialist in the publication of the Bureau. This so-called labor group, however, is in reality merely a more or less Socialistic peasants' party. But it has been in close league with the Socialists and still has immense prestige among the peasants in spite of the fact that the number of representatives of this group was reduced from over a hundred in the first Duma to 10 in the fourth. This reduction, be it said, was due largely to the change in the election laws and to police oppression, which is more effective in the country than in the towns.

The Social Revolutionary Party has almost been driven out of open electoral activity. The central committees and permanent organization of the peasants' party—because of the vulnerability of rural agitation—have also been almost annihilated. The leading organized movement is therefore

that of the Social Democratic Labor Party,—with its various factions and affiliated national groups.

II. THE ELECTIONS OF 1912

The suffrage in Russia is unequal, indirect, and complicated in many other ways. Nevertheless, the elections indicate the growth of the movement better than the membership of the two Socialist parties, both of which have usually been “illegal”—even when not given over to violent resistance to governmental despotism. Membership in these parties is usually a punishable offense. But voting for Socialist candidates—often undeclared, and only identified by the voters through personal knowledge—is usually safe, in spite of police supervision and interference.

In the face of steadily increasing electoral restrictions and police interference, however, the Dumas have become more and more oppositional until the last (fourth) Duma actually refused to approve the budget, the purpose for which it was created. This refusal was largely due, no doubt, to the persecution of the capitalist and business interests at the hands of the reigning bureaucracy, supported by the military, ecclesiastical, and landlord caste. But it was also due in part to the rise of the Socialist vote among the middle classes of the cities and towns.

On account of increasing governmental oppression the Socialists were unable to increase their delegation to the fourth Duma, though they re-elected the 14 representatives as in the previous Duma.

These results indicate that under equal suffrage the Socialists, together with the Laborites, would again sweep Russia as in 1907. For under the more favorable, but extremely undemocratic, electoral law of the second Duma (1907) the Socialists secured 101 and the Laborites 116 out of a total of 504 deputies. The Socialists continue to

hold the overwhelming majority of the wage-earners, and besides make steady progress among the poorer professional classes and other elements of the lower middle classes of the towns.

In six of the largest purely Russian cities, the electoral law reserves six representatives to the wage-earners. All six of those elected were Socialists. Eight other representatives were elected with the aid of the middle-class voters, and especially of those of persecuted nationalities. So in Warsaw the Polish and Jewish Socialists elected their common candidates with the help of other radical voters of their nationality, while a full delegation of Socialists, as usual, was returned from the Caucasus. So also other oppressed nationalities such as the Tartars and Letts tend to support Socialist candidates against the Government.

III. THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC GROUP IN THE FOURTH DUMA

1. TACTICS AND COMPOSITION OF THE GROUP

The Social Democratic group in the fourth Duma numbers 13 deputies. A representative of the Polish Socialist Party, not affiliated with the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party, has been admitted into the group with the right to vote on all questions pertaining to Duma matters. Thus the group has altogether 14 members. In many of their activities they are supported by the so-called "Labor Group," representing mostly peasants and having 10 deputies in the Duma. The Social Democratic and the Labor groups are looked upon in the Russian Parliament as the extreme Left, and are treated as such by the reactionary Right and conservative Center, the latter being the party in power.

The 14 deputies composing the Social Democratic group are divided according to their occupations as follows:

Workingmen	10
Journalists	2
Bookkeeper	1
Merchant	1

The Social Democratic deputies consider that they were elected by the votes of 1,300,000 workingmen.

In the first session of the fourth Duma (November, 1912-June, 1913) the Social Democratic group acted as a unit, all the 13 members agreeing on the questions of tactics in the Duma, while still differing as to various party policies. The difference of opinion mainly centered around the same questions that have split the party. Some claim that the party must try to adjust itself to the present conditions in Russia and endeavor to do as much work as possible in the open, thereby being able to reach larger numbers of the laboring class. The old underground method of work, due to the changes in the Russian political and economic conditions, they claim, is but a waste of energy, and accomplishes nothing. The advocates of this policy are called by the opponents "liquidators." Seven out of 13 deputies uphold this policy. On the other hand, the remaining six, comprising what is known as the Lenin followers in the Social Democratic group, consider the rest traitors to the cause of the revolutionary Social Democracy in Russia, for they believe that the only way left for the Russian Social Democratic Party to remain true is to go back to the old method of work—the underground method.

At the beginning of the second session of the Duma (fall of 1913), these 6 members demanded from the 7 other members that they as a unit shall have equal power to decide questions of tactics in the Duma activities with the other group, though the latter had a majority of 1. The majority group refused this and two separate Social Democratic groups in the Duma resulted.

This split called forth protests from many of the workers in Russia, and resolutions were passed condemning the actions of the groups. It led to bitter internal strife and to discussions in the party press. . . .

Hence the unsuccessful attempt of the German Socialist Party to bring unity between these different factions.

The Social Democratic deputies missed no opportunity to speak on every subject under consideration. Their knowledge of facts and their fearless manner of presenting them from the tribune of the Duma began to worry the Government, particularly as their speeches were later printed in all the newspapers of the country, in accordance with the established custom of printing stenographic reports of all the sessions of the Duma. It often happened that a Social Democratic deputy was stopped from continuing a speech or excluded from several sessions of the Duma for using disrespectful language or for otherwise conducting himself in a manner unbecoming a member of the Imperial Duma. When the Social Democratic deputy Petrovski, for instance, spoke in the Duma about the increase of accidents on the railroads, and placed the crime at the doors of the Government, he was excluded from the Duma for five days.

2. REPUBLICAN DEMONSTRATION IN THE DUMA (June, 1914)

(From an account by David Cummings in the *New York Call*,
July 12, 1914)

“ ‘The only reform we can adopt in order to make the Senate a real defender of justice is to abolish the monarchy and establish in its stead a democratic republic.’

“It was in the course of the consideration of a bill relating to the reformation of the Senate that Tcheidze made the stirring revolutionary remark. In a fiery address he pointed out that the Senate, the highest tribunal

in the country, is dominated by a small clique of the Czar's puppets, which tramples on justice and the rights of the people. He declared that the only workable reform would be the 'establishment of a democratic republic which'—he never had the opportunity to finish the sentence, because of the howling and shouting of the Black Hundred Deputies.

"The Duma, though black in its makeup, has been of great value to the revolutionary movement. It has, for a long time, been the only place where the few representatives of the revolutionary working-class could voice the sentiments of the oppressed people in Russia and let the civilized world know of the real status of affairs in the Czar's empire. It was the only place where free speech prevailed.

"But the Government evidently realized that the frequent disclosures made on the floor of the Duma by the few Socialists, of the oppression and persecution, which were being sent out broadcast by the representatives of the press, were not a desirable thing for the Government. And an attempt to curb free speech followed.

"It was several days after Tcheidze made his revolutionary address that Maklakov, the Minister of International Affairs, appeared in the Duma and demanded that Tcheidze be prosecuted for violating Section 129 of the code relating to sedition and treason. He also demanded that the Laborite (or Peasant Party) Deputy Kerensky be prosecuted on a similar charge.

"The reports current are that the Cabinet approved of the proposed plan to prosecute Tcheidze, but that it was opposed to prosecuting Kerensky. But Minister Maklakov went to the Duma, it is said, at the behest of the Czar, who wanted both prosecuted.

"This action of the Government not only aroused the

indignation of the Socialist and Labor deputies, but also of some of the Conservative deputies. It had for a long time been the opinion that the deputies had a right freely to express their views on any subject under consideration, a right provided for under Section 4 of the rules of the Duma.

“But to prevent the prosecution of Tcheidze, whom the Government wanted punished immediately, some of the deputies proposed that the Duma lay over the budget until that time when the bill relating to free speech was to be taken up.

“‘We will say anything we wish to express, regardless of the punishments that may be inflicted on us,’ began Kerensky. ‘When we find it necessary to point out that the existing conditions lead to a new form of government——’

“At this point Kerensky was called to order by President Rodzianko, an Octobrist, who evidently feared that he, too, would be persecuted for permitting such a speech in the Duma, and requested Kerensky not to speak about the form of government.

“‘We cannot have any respect for those who sing praises of the monarchy which——’

“Here again Kerensky was interrupted with a request not to refer to the monarchy.

“‘We have a right,’ continued Kerensky, ‘to express the opinion that against the monarchy we must put forward the ideal of a republic——’

At this point President Rodzianko refused to permit Kerensky to proceed.

“With a great deal of formality President Rodzianko opened the session the next day. The gallery was packed with government officials and an army of reporters. Quiet reigned in the Duma as the ministers, led by Premier

Goremykin, entered and seated themselves in the Cabinet lodge.

"President Rodzianko took up the proposal of the Socialist and Labor group to postpone action on the budget until the free speech measure had been considered. Tcheidze was called upon as the first speaker. He pointed out that the Socialist deputies are always persecuted, and declared that the situation was becoming worse daily.

" 'Of late we are prohibited from speaking in this tribunal about things that were spoken of even during the darkest periods of the reaction. No longer may we speak about a democratic republic. We cannot any longer speak about republican ideas.'

"He was called to order by the president.

" 'They won't let us speak,' continued Tcheidze, 'about the republican flag, the republican form. . . . Remember, sooner or later, we will come to a democratic rep——'

"Here again he was called to order by Rodzianko. As he attempted to continue, the president stopped him, amid the shouts of the Black deputies. . . .

"But the real dramatic incident occurred when the Socialist Tschechenelli was asked for a statement.

" 'What is the use of talking about free speech when you have no idea what freedom is?' he began. 'Slaves you are and you will remain. But on the other side of the Tauris Palaca (the place where the Duma has its quarters) stand the masses. They will abolish your system——'

"He was interrupted by the president several times, and he left the tribunal for his desk. 'Here I will remain,' he exclaimed. 'Throw me out bodily if you want to.' It was at this point that the soldiery was sent for to exclude Tschechenelli, who left, exclaiming: 'If you practice force I will leave here, you band of slaves.'

“During this incident Vice President Kohevalov left the Duma, slamming the door behind him.

“Prince Gelovanny, a Laborite deputy, was next called. ‘We know that you, the reactionary majority, will conquer us. But we assert that the people are with us and therefore I have joined the obstruction,’ he said.

“Socialist Deputy Kerensky then was called. ‘We know very well that in the struggle we are engaged in against these gentlemen (pointing to the Cabinet members) you will be on their side. But we are certain that, though we are persecuted, we are the only true representatives of the Russian people. As long as the illegal government tramples on the rights of the people we will carry on the fight against the present system. We know what awaits us, but we are willing to sacrifice ourselves in order to establish a government that the people will manage on the principles of universal suffrage.’

“He refused to leave the Duma and the soldiers were ordered to exclude him. He left, exclaiming: ‘Force reigns here, but freedom will be the victor.’

“With the Socialist Petrovsky the same scene was enacted.”

These events were followed, during the next month (July) by the remarkable general strike of which an account is given in Mr. Walling’s volume on *The Socialists and the War*.

FINLAND

In 1907 the Socialist Party elected 80 deputies (9 of them women); in 1911 the deputies were 86 (9 women); and in 1913, 90 Socialists were elected, the other four parties numbering 29, 28, 28, and 25. It casts approximately 40 per cent of the total vote.

IV. THE MOVEMENT IN FINLAND

(From *Die Neue Zeit*, Berlin)

“The development of the Finnish Socialist Party has taken place up to the present in two curves. At the founding of the party in 1899 it had 9,446 members. This number sank in 1901 to 5,894. Immediately after the revolution—1906—this membership increased to 85,000. Then it decreased again and in 1911 the party had 48,406 members. The year 1912 again brought an increase in membership to 51,798 members.

“Of a different character from the increasing and decreasing curve of the membership are the inner life and the inner strength of the party. For instance the number of organizations which have joined the party has increased from year to year. This number grew from 64 in 1899 to 1,552 in 1912. The number of workingmen’s clubhouses, which the Finnish comrades must provide themselves with, since Finland has no restaurants with meeting or assembly rooms, increased in the same period from 14 to 796. There are more clubhouses here than there are churches.

“The libraries in the clubhouses also grow from year to year. In the year 1899 these contained 3,312 volumes, while in 1912 this number had increased to 82,000. The wealth of the organizations connected with the party amounted in 1899 to 285,098 Finnish marks. This amount had increased by 1912 to 6,256,886 marks.

“The same development has taken place in connection with the press and other periodical literature. The present number of papers is the following:

“In six larger towns—Helsingfors, Tammerfors, Abo, Wiborg, Uleaborg, and Lachtis—daily papers are issued. The central organ, *Tyocmies*, in Helsingfors, has a circulation of 30,000, a large number for Finland, and, by the

way, the largest in the country. To these we must add 4 daily Finnish Socialist papers in America, 1 woman's paper, 2 comic journals, and 2 magazines which are also read in Finland.

"The emigration from Finland to America has been going on for decades. The small three million nation of 'the country of the thousand lakes' has sent many thousands of her sons and daughters over the big pond, because the fatherland had become too small for them! (Finland is almost as large as Prussia.) The Finnish workers in America form Socialist organizations after the type of the Fatherland.

"Their number is about 15,000. They have their own party school in Smithville, Minn. The Finns are credited by the American comrades with good organizations."

V. THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY CONVENTION OF FINLAND, 1914

(From *Vorwaerts*)

"The chief question discussed at the Eighth Convention of the Social Democratic Party of Finland, held in Tammerfors, the Finnish Manchester, in 1914, was: Shall the Social Democratic group have the right to elect one of its own members as president of the Landtag, and if so, under what circumstances? The Socialist representatives last spring participated in the election of a president of the Landtag and elected a comrade, Oskar Tokoi. The action of the group was criticised within and without the party as opportunistic.

"In the Convention a large majority of the speakers expressed themselves in favor of the action of the Landtag group, although a number of them pointed out the danger of going too far along this line.

“The Convention decided that, as a rule, no member of the Social Democratic Party should be a candidate for the presidency. Where, on account of capitalist intrigues or capitalist exploitation, it seemed advisable to elect a Socialist to the presidency, permission, however, was granted to do this, providing the comrade in question was immediately freed from the impossible situation as soon as the necessity which furnished the motive for the election had disappeared. A strong minority of 44 out of 89, on the other hand, demanded that a Social Democratic president, once elected, should hold his seat till the end of the session.

“The Convention also adopted a sharp resolution against the plan of the Russian Government to levy a grain tax on the Finnish people, and struck a blow at the same time against the Finnish landowners who were openly or secretly supporting the new measure. The tax, it was declared, would increase the price of the bread by one-third, practically prohibiting the importation of German and American grain.

“The Party Convention was again forced to protest against renewed instances of capitalist-class justice. There are generally a number of Socialist editors and agitators in jail. On this occasion the protest was made against Russia on account of its unwarranted prosecution of Finnish officials. A steadily growing number of Finnish magistrates were languishing in the jails of St. Petersburg for refusing to assist in the execution of the illegal demands of the Russian Government. Although the proletariat itself had often suffered from the partisan spirit of these same officials, it gladly tendered them its tribute in such cases where they had defended the laws and the autonomy of the country.

“In considering party matters, the question of the rela-

tion of the party to its newspapers was found of particular importance. A number of years ago the question arose as to the advisability of bringing the largest Social Democratic newspaper, *Tyomies*, the central organ of the party, with a daily circulation of 27,000, published in Helsingfors, into closer contact with the party. The workingmen owners of the paper feared that the proposed changes would rob the *Tyomies* of its proletarian character, inasmuch as they considered the majority of the party more or less revisionistic.

“At this convention the executive board presented a resolution recognizing in principle the right of the party to control its chief organ and insisted, among other things, that the editorial staff be appointed by the executive board. After a lively discussion this resolution was adopted with a vote of 51 to 39.”

CHAPTER VII

HOLLAND AND SWITZERLAND

HOLLAND

I. INTRODUCTORY

THE Social Democratic Labor Party was founded in Holland in 1894. Three years later at the general election it polled 13,000 votes and elected 3 deputies in a chamber of 100. In 1901 its vote grew to 38,279 and its deputies were 8. In 1905 its popular vote was 65,743, but its deputies only 7; in 1910 it had 82,494 votes and still only 7 deputies; but in June, 1913, with a popular vote increase to 144,000, it secured 19 seats in Parliament. The party has 1 daily paper, 14 weeklies, and 7 other periodicals.

II. THE PARTY CONGRESS OF 1914

(From *Vorwaerts*)

“The first day of the Congress was devoted to discussion of the year’s report made by the executive committee, and to the report of the parliamentary section. A short dispute took place between delegates Mendels and Troelstra, relative to war budgets, Mendels declaring that each war budget showing increased expenditures must be opposed; Troelstra, on the other hand, declaring that under certain conditions the party must support a war budget to prevent the overthrow of an electoral franchise cabinet.

“At the afternoon session a resolution of the executive

committee regarding election agitation was discussed. The Congress voted unanimously in favor of setting aside a week day for a demonstration on this subject. All work was to stop, in case the Upper House opposed the revision of the constitution. A proposal to co-operate with the Liberals in certain provincial elections was accepted by a large majority.”

III. SOCIALIST PARTY PROGRAM

At the eighteenth Party Congress which took place at Leyden in April, 1913, the discussion and adoption of *a new program* aroused greatest interest. The program explained by Troelstra and van der Goes was accepted in the following form:

The development of society has led to a form of capitalistic production in which the mass of producers is separated from the means of production. This enables owners to make profits from workers, who are driven by necessity to sell their productive powers. Two classes, the proletariat and the capitalistic class, are opposed to each other continually on account of their varying interests.

Under this system competition and profit force a continual improvement of the technique for the reduction of wages. They lead to accumulation of wealth by the capitalistic class, and to poverty, uncertainty of existence, and dependence, trying, monotonous and unhealthy work of men and women, overlong working-hours and unemployment, child labor, destruction of family life and the weakening of the physique in the proletariat. It also leads to continued pauperism and prostitution, alcoholism, and crime. The working-class, where it is unable to check the capitalistic hunger for profit, falls a prey to deterioration and misery, only limited by the natural bounds of human privation and by the requirements of the capitalist interests themselves. The disproportion between the increasing productivity of the workers and the small consuming powers of the masses and the absence of social regulation of production lead again and again to crises in industrial life, which still further intensify tendencies of capitalistic production.

This causes resistance among the proletariat. The workers organize themselves into unions and into parties on the political field. They realize more and more that it is their task to fight capitalism as a system and to try to take over the management of society. In its fight for political rights and social reform, the working-class, as long as it is in the minority, comes up against the superior force of the ruling class, which, under the influence of the growing power of the proletariat, meets the demands of the latter reluctantly, and only as far as the maintenance of their domination and the nature of the capitalistic system permit.

In the meanwhile, capitalistic development itself creates the economic preliminary condition for a new productive system, which does not depend on the suppression of one class by the other, but on social ownership and administration of the means of production, the object of which is not the profit of individuals, but the satisfaction of the needs of all classes.

Competition and the advance of science force us towards production on a large scale, and, on this account, decrease the importance of smaller industries, make the smaller manufacturers dependent on the large industrial undertakings, or force them to become wage-earners.

Though this process of concentration of management does not show itself to-day in the same manner in agricultural undertaking as in trade, transportation, and industry, one can see the gradually increasing power of capital in the spreading of the leasing system, and also in the growing influence of industrial undertakings in agriculture, and the movement towards the monopolization of the market by large capital. Wherever the agrarian small undertaking holds out against the large enterprise or spreads itself, we can be certain that those who find their existence by it overwork themselves and live in privation. This proves that the small farmer in the future, with his demand for a higher standard of living, will unite with the working-class. In addition to this, an increasingly large part of actual agrarian work has been taken over into the sphere of industry, through the development of the factory system.

The continued development of large-scale production competition endangers profits; this again leads to a further increase of capitalistic monopoly and to further restriction of the sphere of the competition. Industry and commerce come more and more

under the rule of banking capital; profit becomes independent of any function in production and exchange. The capitalist loses his importance as a manager of an industrial enterprise and becomes nothing but a parasite. The management is arranged on such a footing that it is ripe to be taken over by society. With this stage, the foundation is laid for the Socialistic system of production and for production for the general good. In the meantime, numerous industries are already being conducted by public instead of private administrative bodies and the co-operative system also limits the sphere of private life.

With the increasing possibility of Socialism there develops a growing desire for it, along with the power to realize it. The immense increase of wealth and luxuries of the capitalists induces the worker to demand more of life's comforts, while the increase of rents, a consequence of overpopulation in large towns, and the increased cost of living, lower his condition. The divisions inside of the capitalist class become less evident the more the pressure of the workers for new rights and reforms increases, and the more dangerous he becomes to society and the capitalist system. This is proved by the formation of employers' unions opposing the trade-unions of workers, just as in the political field. The magnates of capital, at the head of giant trusts, who make entire society tributary by their control of raw material, transportation, and the means of production, understand how to make use of administrations and legislation. They drive governments to imperialism and colonial politics, and in connection with these to increased military burdens and increasing discord in international relations.

At the same time, the power of the workers against capital is increasing. A growing numerical preponderance of the proletariat follows industrial concentration. A new element developing in its ranks is the "new middle-class," technical experts, and employees of large industries, who, in regard to uncertainty of existence and dependence on the capitalists, resemble the workers. With it come groups whose interests, though not directly opposed to those of capitalism, have no share in its management. . . . The proletariat receives in and through the class struggle an experience, a scientific and political education, a social and ethical improvement, and an expansion and strengthening of its organization, that will not only fit it to break the resistance of the ruling class but which will also fit it for the task of filling their

place. It is invincible in this aspiration because it has to fulfill its historical task of freeing society from a system which has become economically obsolete and which is ethically condemned.

The proletariat can break the resistance offered by the capitalist class to the taking over of the management of industries from private to collective ownership only through the conquest of political power. For this purpose the workers, who have come to a consciousness of their task in the class struggle, have organized all over the world.

The Social Democratic Labor Party in the Netherlands has as its goal the organization of the proletariat of the Netherlands into an independent political party for the participation in the international struggle of the working-class. It aims at unity in the proletarian class struggle, and supports, as far as it can, every economic and political movement of the workers which strives to better conditions of living in such a manner that the class consciousness of the workers is strengthened and their power as against that of the ruling class is increased.

IV. THE RESULT OF PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS IN HOLLAND

By F. M. Wibaut. (1913.)

“The Social Democratic Labor platform in the past election was practically a demand for universal suffrage. It is well known that the Marxian Socialists in 1909 demanded that the question of universal suffrage be made our sole issue. At that time we also emphasized other demands, such as old-age pension, the ten-hour day, etc. Our agitation in the last years, though not lacking in energy, was carried on in such a manner that no serious differences arose between the ‘reform’ and ‘Marxian’ wings of the party. The feeling that no reforms can be won until general suffrage is an accomplished fact has taken root everywhere, and the whole party is unanimously in favor of making the struggle wholly a fight for the right to vote.

“Our program included only one other demand, namely,

that the free old-age pension of at least two gulden weekly for men and women over 70 years of age, that has just been accepted by the Parliament as introduced by the Government in its invalid bill, be sustained should the parties of the Left demand the nullification of the invalid insurance bill. . . . With this one exception, our party declared that the Government could not be regarded as a body fit for effective legislation until at least manhood suffrage had been made a fact by constitutional amendment. This situation forced the parties of the Left to promise their support of a universal suffrage measure in order to retain its power. Our party waged an energetic fight against increased tariffs, but our attention was concentrated mainly upon the one question of universal suffrage. . . .

“The Free Liberals accepted the phrase ‘General Suffrage,’ but desired to offset its evil effects by giving increased powers to the Senate, the upper Chamber. To-day our Senate can only adopt or reject bills. . . . Our party is opposed to the Senate, even in its present restricted form, because of its plutocratic character and its firm opposition to all labor legislation.

“When, therefore, we were called upon to decide what should be our participation in the by-elections, we demanded from all candidates of the Left the promise that they would unqualifiedly oppose any increase in the powers of the Senate in the coming constitutional revision. . . .

“Three days before the by-elections, when they saw that our party insisted upon a definite personal acceptance of our proposal, they all accepted except one Free Liberal candidate. . . .

“Then, and only then, did our executive board call upon our voters to support the candidates of the Left who had definitely promised to support our measure in the

coming session. Not one among all the candidates of the Right favored extended suffrage. In the general election, of course, we supported only our 94 candidates against the Left as well as against the Right. In the by-election we supported the Left only where it positively guaranteed its position as the ruling party. There was nothing resembling a fusion between the Progressives and the Socialists.

“The results in the by-elections were as follows:

	New Parliament	Old Parliament
Catholics	25	26
Calvinists	11	20
Christian Histories	9	13
	— 45	— 59
Liberal Union	20	21
Free Liberals	10	4
Progressive Democrats	7	9
	— 37	— 34
Social Democratic L. P.....	18	7
	18	— 7
	<hr/> 100	<hr/> 100

“Our party had advanced, as the table shows, from 7 to 18 seats. With this great increase, we hold to-day the number of seats that approximately corresponds to the vote cast for our party. . . .

“The Catholic-Calvinistic government was overthrown. . . . The only [non-Socialist] group . . . that reported a marked gain were the Free Liberals, the representatives of large capital. . . . The Progressive Fusion will head the government. It will only hold its place, however, if it holds to its election promises, and carries out our demands quickly and faithfully.

“Some time ago it was maintained by our Marxists that the party was more influential in the outlying agrarian

districts than in the larger cities. They feared that this might have an unfavorable effect upon the movement and might cause it to degenerate into middle-class reform channels. In 1909 we received the first comforting assurance that this fear was groundless.

"In this election we show an astounding increase, particularly in the large cities and industrial centers, among the people from whom we may expect the most enthusiastic support of our purely Socialist propaganda.

"The election percentage of the Social Democracy averages as follows:

OUT OF 100 VOTES CAST				
	1901	1905	1909	1913
1. In large cities including more than one election district (Amsterdam, Rotterdam, Haag, and Utrecht) .	10.9	15.7	21.3	32.8
2. In smaller cities which form one election district (Groningen, Haarlem, Leiden, Arnhem)	13.4	12.5	13.3	23.1
3. In those districts where a small city holds more than one-half of the voters of the district	13.5	13.9	16.8	26.4
4. In industrial districts in the country	17.6	17.9	19.7	22.9
5. The remaining districts, usually wholly or at least half-agrarian (not including the provinces Brabant and Limburg)	17.4	11.7	9.6	12.4

"These figures prove that in the large cities every third voter cast his ballot for the Social Democratic Labor ticket, while in 1909 only 1 out of 5, in 1905 less than 1 out of 6, in 1900 only 1 out of 10 were with us. In the other municipal districts as represented by groups 2 and 3 of the table, every fourth voter voted our ticket. In 1909 the proportion was 1 out of 7, in 1905, 1 out of 8. This shows that

universal suffrage will soon give us the majority of votes in the large cities.

“On the other hand, we find that in 1901, 65 out of every 100 Socialist votes came from the country, while only 35 came from city districts. In 1913 this proportion was already reversed. Now 53 out of every 100 votes came from municipal and only 47 from country districts. This, too, proves that our party is growing chiefly in the sections occupied by the modern proletariat. . . .

“The growth of our membership and the great increase in the circulation of our party press during the past years justify the most sanguine expectations. This may be ascribed, partly, to the systematic, intensive distribution of good leaflets during the past two years. A great part of our success, however, we owe to our growing deepening agitation for the right to vote.

“Our suffrage agitation is carried on, at all times, for men and women alike. The election program of the progressive parties of the Government does not demand woman suffrage for the coming constitutional amendment. There is little hope that we will succeed this time in doing more than to keep out of the constitution all clauses that may become a hindrance to the passage of a women suffrage bill in the future. . . .

“Besides the 144,375 Social Democratic Labor votes cast for our party, there were other Socialist votes. The Social Democratic Party, the party of the Marxians, who left our ranks at Deventer, had nominated candidates in 18 districts. Their total vote was 1,340. Four years ago they polled 542. At that time there seemed a possibility of their development into a real political party. Since then the S. D. P. has constantly insisted that it alone represents Marxism in Holland, that the proletariat of the large cities would join its ranks. The vote cast in its favor in the

4 Amsterdam districts was 56, 117, 18, and 147, as compared with 1,837, 7,309, 1,511, 8,204 in the same districts in favor of the Social Democratic Labor Party.”

.

V. THE GENERAL POLITICAL SITUATION IN HOLLAND

(From *Vorwaerts*, December 18, 1913)

“The Dutch Social Democracy is living through stirring times. The first part of the year 1913 was completely taken up with the enthusiastic campaign, culminating in a glorious victory on June 25. But . . . right after the election the party faced, for the first time, the difficult task of deciding for or against participation in the formation of a ministry. It was only after an extremely heated discussion that a final decision was reached on August 10 . . . [against such participation]. Though the party remained united, it is hardly to be expected that any movement should pass through such a crisis unscarred. . . . We need hardly say that the capitalist press is unanimous in denouncing us as traitors to the cause of democracy and social reform. In the meantime only 2 of the 5 special elections in the districts that we had captured in June resulted in our favor. . . . The loss of 3 out of 18 seats has made a deep impression within as well as outside the party. . . . The time was ripe for a union of capitalist forces against us in the by-elections. The suppression of the Social Democracy must be accomplished at all cost. Our action in the ministerial crisis may, perhaps, have been an added factor. . . .

“How does our parliamentary group stand toward the Government? In general the party is following out its usual tactics; it supports every measure that is in the interest of the proletariat and opposes everything that

may harm the labor movement. . . . For the first time Holland has a Cabinet that depends considerably upon our support, whose program, as a whole, includes the most progressive measures promised to our party by the Liberals before the by-elections. Already a bill providing for the extension of free old-age pensions to cover all aged people has been placed upon the order of business. . . . The self-evident tendency of the last elections makes it impossible for a government to refuse to carry out the reforms that stand at the zenith of popular interest. . . . Our parliamentary tactics must now be concentrated upon the realization of the governmental program in all of its reform measures. But that does not mean that we sell out, body and soul, to our capitalist rulers. We fully uphold our right, our duty, as Socialists, to criticise everything the Government, the administration, the judiciary may do. The necessity of preserving this liberty was, in fact, one of the main arguments in favor of our refusal to join the Ministry. This is the more necessary, because the governmental program is double-faced. On the one side it shows the reform, while on the other side is revealed, with brutal frankness, the upholding of militarism. That is the dark cloud in the beautiful sky of bourgeois democracy. The Crown speech contained the following sentence: 'For the defense of Netherland-India, we propose the building of a dreadnought, the cost of which shall be covered from Indian funds.'

"This marks the first invasion of imperialism on a larger scale into Holland. . . . The invasion of capital into the Far East calls forth there the same struggles that marked colonization along the Atlantic and the North Sea a hundred or more years ago. We know that this means increased armaments. The mad rush for military supremacy, in small countries like Holland, is fatal to all social prog-

ress. Into this world-pool our little nation is being drawn. . . .

“It is plain demagogy . . . to try to prove that the military budget would be entirely different if the Social Democrats had not refused to elect members into the Ministry. . . . [Certain comrades] favored participation in ministerial government, partly because [they] feared that the failure to form a Liberal-Socialist cabinet would mean a cabinet that would support the Right in the question of increased military expenditure. . . . In our opinion, exactly the reverse is true. The Liberals were so insistent in their request that we form a ministry in conjunction with them because they desired to stifle our opposition to their military plans at the outset. One can hardly conceive of a more beautiful opportunity to make us share responsibility for new, oppressive military appropriations. . . .”

VI. THE MINISTERIAL CRISIS IN HOLLAND AND THE SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

By J. Fedder, Amsterdam

(From *Vorwaerts*, August 30, 1913)

“Shortly after our comrades in Denmark had refused to send a number of its members into the Ministry, the question of ministerialism arose in the party of Holland. . . . [The] form of ministerialism, in which Social Democrats accept a place in the Ministry as the representatives of their party, is of far greater consequence to the movement than is the case of Briand or Millerand, who were called upon, as individuals, to participate in the administration. . . .

“Let us see what happened. . . .

“The *Vorwaerts* has already reported the wonderful suc-

cess of our Social Democratic Labor Party in the last election, where our vote increased from 82,000 in 1909 to 144,000, and our representation from 7 to 18 men.

“Immediately after the by-elections which decided the fate of the clerical majority, the Christian ministry was compelled to resign. After a conference with the most prominent political leaders, among them, for the first time, one of our comrades, Troelstra, the Queen called upon the Radical leader, Dr. Bos, to form a ministry ‘out of the whole Left’ (as we read in the communication of the press). On July 12, Comrade Troelstra, as chairman of our group, received a communication in which we were officially offered the privilege of electing three members to a ministry, for whose activity Dr. Bos presented the following program:

1. Constitutional amendment providing general suffrage for men, without altering the rights of the Upper House. Removal of all hindrances to the adoption of woman suffrage. Removal of all hindrances to the right of women to hold office.

2. Extension of the Invalid bill just passed, so that its free old-age pension may apply not only to wage-workers, but to all needy aged people.

3. The money necessary to defray these expenditures to be raised by levying direct taxes (chiefly income and property taxes).

“This program was the exact expression of the last election, and was a reiteration of the affirmative answer to our demands given us by the Liberals before the by-election.

“In his answer, Comrade Troelstra wrote that the proposed program was, in every sense of the word, a ‘sound basis for any ministry which would take the reins at the present time.’

“But he called attention to one dark spot in the letter which offered to our party the ministerial portfolio; it

contained not a word to prove the absolute necessity of a co-ordination between Liberals and Social Democrats. This, however, was necessary, because the Social Democrats would not consider participation in the Ministry unless this necessity was clearly proved. Our action was based upon the resolution adopted by the International Congress of 1900. (See Chapter I, Part I.) To us there existed only one question: was the necessity such that it would warrant our sending ministers to take an active part in a capitalist administration?

“A clear answer to this question was the more necessary—as Comrade Troelstra showed clearly and uncompromisingly—because a Liberal-Socialist ministry must be much more powerful to withstand clerical attacks than is necessary for one that is formed of Liberals only.

“The capitalist character of the state had been ratified by the votes of more than 82 per cent of the nation, and must therefore bring with it a capitalist government. This was a necessity, which could not be avoided at present, not even if three Socialists should enter the Ministry.

“In every question of fundamental importance, as for instance, our colonial policy, militarism, judicial problems, the attitude of the Government toward strikes and lockouts that are sure to take place, in a hundred minor questions of daily routine business, the impossibility of harmonious co-operation between Socialists and Liberals, the eternal conflict of their views in international and political problems, would become increasingly evident. This would inevitably injure the activity of the Ministry.

“This is the more likely because the Clericals still hold a majority in the Upper House, which can be held in check only by a strong Ministry. Comrade Troelstra asked, therefore, the open question: Is the co-operation of the Social Democratic Party with the Fusion of the Liberal

parties a condition *sine qua non* if the proposed program is to be carried out?

“Realizing our responsibility to the proletariat in the struggle for universal suffrage and for a free old-age pension, the Social Democratic group, through Troelstra, declared its readiness to support a ministry that should carry these points as important parts of its program. It even promised to support the military budget during the time necessary for the passage of the above bills, provided the total of this budget was not larger than that of the budget for 1912-1913.

“There would be no complete fusion of the two parties, [but] for a definite period of time, to be determined beforehand, we promised our support, because we feared that the Clerical minority would vote against the budget, in order to prevent the passage of the reform measures, by precipitating a new ministerial crisis.

“Dr. Bos’ answer to this letter and the demands made therein was very unclear. . . .

“Thereupon a conference of the executive board, the members of Parliament, and the editors of our organ, *Het Volk*, was called July 19, which rejected the offer of three portfolios by 13 votes against 8. The minority feared the uncertainty likely to result from our refusal and preferred taking the more certain path. The majority was composed of two groups, those who absolutely refused entrance into the Ministry at the present time, and those who were willing to consider it in time of necessity, but were of the opinion that this necessity did not exist at the present time. . . . On July 30, the Liberal Fusion answered by refusing to undertake alone the formation of a ministry, in spite of our promised assistance. . . .

“The chairman and vice-chairman of our party, the Comrades Vliegen and Schaper, after visiting Dr. Bos, called

a second party conference. The following questions were discussed: (1) Does this refusal of the Liberals constitute the necessity mentioned in the Amsterdam resolution? (2) Would the participation of the Socialists in the Ministry increase the possibility of carrying out the program proposed by Bos?

"The majority of the Conference now favored the acceptance of cabinet portfolios. Two resolutions were presented and an extraordinary party convention called.

"The Convention met in Zwolle on the ninth and tenth of August. After a heated discussion, the resolution proposed by the minority of the party conference was adopted by a vote of 375 against 320. The resolution expressed the following:

A party like the Social Democratic Labor Party, that is in its origin and character unalterably opposed to capitalist rule, is not obliged to enter a capitalist Ministry.

The Social Democratic Labor Party has done its full duty in the fight for universal suffrage and old-age pensions by its willingness to support every cabinet which will strive to realize these reforms.

On the other hand, the Liberal Fusion has made the solution of this problem exceedingly difficult by insisting upon a Liberal Socialist Ministry.

This action of the Liberals does not follow from a lack of power, but rather from a lack of good will. The exceptional necessity that is mentioned in the Resolution of the International Congress of 1900 does not exist.

The participation of Socialists in a capitalist Ministry would not be in the interests of the proletariat, therefore, considering the present political situation.

.

"Our participation in the Ministry would have completely changed our method of political combat, and our attitude toward the other parties for some time to come.

In this case we would have rested on our arms and declared a temporary peace with progressive capitalist parties. The issue at stake in this case, as a constitutional amendment, necessitates a parliamentary discussion of the question in two sessions, as well as a dissolution of both Houses and a new election. In consequence this co-operation of Socialist and Liberal forces would necessarily extend over a period of years (at least five or six). During this time all open warfare between the party, as the political representative of the proletariat, and its capitalist opponents, would be practically at a standstill. Dr. Bos, even in his first request for participation, spoke of the necessity of a union of forces in the Government, in the Lower House, and in the nation.

“The last years have brought to Holland a notable increase in the strength and militancy of its labor unions. A union with the Liberals would, in all probability, mean a disturbance in the present harmonious and profitable relations between the labor unions and the party.

“But even from a purely political point of view, the party would inevitably be discredited. The speaker of the majority pointed out that, as a part of the Ministry, we would be held responsible for its activity, a fact that would surely cost us the sympathy of a large part of the general public, unless we were in a large majority in the cabinet. It is more than doubtful, however, whether this condition will ever be fulfilled, whether, in this advanced stage of the class struggle, we would still be asked to take a portfolio in a ministry. For, after all, this request to join the Ministry is a sign of our weakness rather than of our strength.

“These are two dangers that should not be taken too lightly, dangers that are practically sure to result. Added to these considerations is a third which must not be over-

looked. We are risking the unity of our movement. A complete change of party tactics, such as is here involved, must needs arouse a storm of bitter recriminations between the representatives on either side, would strike into the parliamentary group, and would greatly impair the efficiency and energy of our organization. And this at a time when the Socialist movement in the Netherlands is just slowly beginning to unite its forces, at a time when the enemies of our movement, the Syndicalists, who are still powerful in a number of industries, and a small party of the Marxians, would profit by our quarrels. . . .

“The old-age pension bill has become more and more popular as a result of 15 years of Socialist agitation. . . . We could not allow this reform, whose realization has been practically assured by the election, to vanish into thin air. . . . Let us examine for a moment the general political influence of the decision of this Convention.

“The Holland Parliament is made up of two large divisions: on the Right, the Christians, composed of two evangelic-clerical parties and one Catholic party (which is by far the strongest of the three), who together are known by the collective name, ‘The Coalition’; on the Left are three closely united progressive parties, known as ‘The Concentration,’ and the Social Democracy. This division into two fields, the so-called antithesis between believers and unbelievers, is a heavy burden upon our internal politics, and particularly weakens the working-class. Its ranks have been split by the struggle between these elements. The Clericals especially have enjoyed the implicit support of a considerable number of workers who under all circumstances will vote in their favor.

“The active and independent campaign of the Social Democratic Labor Party for universal suffrage has, for the first time, succeeded in shaking the allegiance of a large

number of these Christian voters. This fortunate beginning would have been severely hampered by a strengthening of this line of religious opposition. The deepening of this line of demarcation between believer and unbeliever, which would have resulted from a fusion of our forces with the Liberals, would have been anything but favorable to our influence upon this part of the population.

“Even from a purely parliamentary point of view, such a fusion would have been unwise. Dividing the Parliament into two opposing bodies would have meant to sacrifice the vote of those Clericals who, otherwise, would have voted in favor of a general suffrage bill. As a constitutional amendment, however, this bill required a two-thirds vote of Parliament in its favor, while the combined forces of the Liberals and the Socialists number only 54 out of 100, making a considerable number of Clerical votes necessary to secure its passage.

“Why is the decision of the party Convention of such extraordinary importance?

“Because, apparently, we have entered upon a new stage in Dutch politics. The slow disintegration of the once powerful Liberals is already so far advanced that, even in a particularly favorable political situation, they were able to unite only about 30 per cent of the total vote upon their candidates, and could win, with our assistance, only 38 seats. So it has come about that the Liberals, without our support, are powerless in Parliament. . . . If, now, the Liberal Concentration were truly democratic, it would not hesitate for one moment to pass those reform measures, so necessary in our reactionary little country, with the help of the Social Democrats. . . .

“But, alas, . . . their democratic wing is damned to eternal incompetence, is heard bravely and confidently only when it is in the opposition. (In Holland one must

be careful not to identify the expressions 'Left' and 'Democracy.' The parties of the Right, on the other hand, include a goodly number of democratic supporters, upholders of universal suffrage. . . .)

"There is only one consideration that might lead [the] reactionary enemies of the working-class to push the reforms that we demand, reforms that they themselves have bitterly opposed up to very recent times. That is the possibility of breaking up the power of the proletarian political movement. Everything indicates that this was in truth their secret aim—slowly to transform our own virile, thriving party into a sort of Liberal Labor Party, to bind our young movement to their own aged decrepit parties. This ambition has suffered a pitiful shipwreck upon the hard rocks of our solidarity."

.

SWITZERLAND

The Social Democratic Party of Switzerland was founded in 1888. In 1910 it had only 10 seats in a Parliament of 189 members. In 1912 this number had been increased to 17, and in 1913 to 19. The party has also 1 representative in the Upper House. The election of 1914, held after the outbreak of the war, was only half contested and did not show any material change. In the 1915 elections the Socialists retained their membership of 19.

The report of the Swiss Party for 1913 shows an increase of 1,852 in membership, which, at the end of the year, stood at 33,236, in 609 branches. In 1915 it was reported as 29,585 members.

At the cantonal elections of 1914, a Socialist loss was suffered in Basel, where the representation was cut down

from 47 to 43—still about one-third of the total. In Bern the delegation was increased from 15 to 16. In Geneva, where proportional representation was applied for the first time, the Socialists elected 10 members, as against 22 members elected by their opponents.

CHAPTER VIII

DENMARK, SWEDEN, AND NORWAY

DENMARK

I. INTRODUCTORY

IN Denmark the Social Democratic Party was founded in 1878; since 1901 its membership in the Folkething (House of Representatives) has increased from 14 to 16, to 24, to 32, and at the last general election (May, 1913) the Socialists, with 107,000, obtained the largest popular vote of all the political parties. They have 33 daily papers, with a circulation of 170,000 copies.

In 1903 the party had 56,000; in 1909, 93,000; in 1910, 98,000 votes (29 per cent of the total votes), so that the rise has been more rapid than ever in recent years.

The party has been especially successful in municipal elections, and has one-half of the members of the Copenhagen municipal council.

As the Radicals secured 31 seats in 1913, and the Liberals and Conservatives together held only 51, the combined opposition (Socialists and Radicals) had a majority.

Following the election the Government introduced a measure in the Lower House enfranchising all men and women, but it did not secure a majority in the Second Chamber, which was accordingly dissolved. The result of the elections which followed (in 1914) was that the new Landsting contains 38 supporters of the bill and 28 opponents; the old Landsting had 33 on each side.

Of the elected members of the new Upper House, 4 are Socialists, 5 are Radicals, 20 are Liberals, 5 are "Free" Conservatives, and 20 are Conservatives unqualified. The king has the power to nominate 12 members. Of these 9 are supporters of the government bill.

The Parliament met in July, but the constitutional change required for its final adoption a second election in August—which was interrupted by the war.

The growth of the Socialist vote, as has been said, has been very rapid—from 56,000 in 1903 to 107,000 in 1913 (out of a total of 366,000). The vote of the Radical Party has also grown from 41,000 in 1906 to 67,000 in 1913; so that the two parties together already have almost a majority.

II. THE SOCIALISTS SUPPORT THE GOVERNMENT

(From *The New York Call*)

"The last general election in Denmark resulted in a majority for the opposition. The ministerial crisis placed squarely before the Socialists the question of participation in the Ministry and of parliamentary collaboration. Consultations on this subject were held by the Radicals and the Socialist Party, the latter finally rejecting the proposals that they participate in the formation of a cabinet of the Left.

"The Socialists, however, engaged to support the Radical government until such time as the reform program should be completely realized. This program includes the abolition of electoral privileges, universal suffrage without distinction of sex, and other things.

"They, therefore, are pledged to approve the budget now presented by the Radicals. The Danish budget is very modest compared with those of the larger European na-

tions, and only amounts to 126,000,000 crowns (a crown is 27 cents).

“But the present budget also comprises some reforms. The military expenditures are, for the first time, not increased. In fact, there is a decrease of 1,000,000. And the Government has included several measures to satisfy the Socialist Party, without the support of which it could not exist.

“Large bounties are granted to agricultural workers wishing to purchase land in the insufficiently cultivated districts. A large part of the Socialist Party’s support comes from these agricultural workers and small farmers. The working-class industrial schools are also subsidized, and the Government even proposes to vote a subsidy of 2,000 crowns to a school founded by the Socialist Party.

“About 4,000,000 crowns are to be devoted to sick and unemployment relief funds. This sum will be paid into the treasuries of the labor unions. Old-age pensions (payable at the age of 65) will cost the Government 6,250,000, and about 250,000 crowns are to be expended for the relief of those ‘temporarily’ in poverty.

“To insurance against industrial accidents 207,000 crowns will be apportioned; 200,000 for the relief of widows and orphans; 2,000,000 for the combating of tuberculosis.

“Viewed merely in the light of a reform party, the Socialist Party of Denmark would seem to be fairly successful in its efforts.”

III. THE CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS

In the fall of 1913 the following constitutional changes were proposed by the prime minister and formed the issue of the following election campaign:

“Active and passive suffrage in Parliament is given to women. The age of suffrage is lowered to 25 instead of

30 as hitherto. The length of the sessions is increased to 4 years instead of 3 years as hitherto. The privileged suffrage for the first chamber is to be abolished as well as the clause which allows the king to name 12 of the 66 members. These are now to be elected by the other 54."

IV. GENERAL SUFFRAGE IN DENMARK

1. ARTICLE BY TH. STAUNING, COPENHAGEN

(From *Vorwaerts*, April 15, 1914)

"The Conservative Party (*Hoeire*) had become so weak in 1901 that it was no longer able to govern. The peasant party (*Venstre*), which was in the majority in the Folke-thing, was asked to take over the government. This action meant acknowledgment of parliamentary rule by the king and the fight for this principle was won.

"After the attainment of this goal, it naturally followed that the Socialists should start an agitation for a revision of the constitution and for universal and equal suffrage. This demand was made in common with the government party, but this party was now not very enthusiastic for the execution of its program.

"The Left, which had grown out of the party of down-trodden peasants, had, in the course of time, undergone some changes. The peasants, which still make up the nucleus of its voters, have not remained the despised and down-trodden class. Good organizations and the benefits derived from co-operation in the service of agriculture (co-operative dairies, slaughter houses, and so on) have contributed to establish a well-to-do peasant class. The peasants who had charge of the government felt very far removed from the working-class, and their leading politicians seemed attracted to the upper class.

"The politics of the new government party were by no

means democratic. On the contrary, this party carried through military, custom's tariff, and [other] policies according to the best conservative models, whereby the working-class had to bear the heaviest burdens.

“The party was able in 1908 to pass a new communal election law, which did away with the two-class electoral law, and gave general suffrage to all taxpaying men and women of 25 years of age, as well as to all married women whose husbands were taxpayers. On account of the work of certain allied conservative elements in Parliament, this law did not prove a thoroughgoing democratic reform, as the upper classes in the country had the privilege of using their influence in selecting the county councilors (an institution which in certain cases formed the superior court for community representation).

“This policy, carried out in alliance with the Right wing, had its effect. The Left wing was badly beaten at the elections by the Socialists. Moreover a split occurred in the Left, the democratic elements forming a new party—the Radical Left. The party of the Left, which, in 1901, had 92 seats out of 114, had gradually melted away, so that at the election in 1910, 57 seats, just half of all the seats of the Folkething, could be claimed by it. In the following years the Left, on account of a number of very costly military laws, favored a very undemocratic policy which called forth a storm of indignation.

“The party decided on a special move shortly before the new elections to the Folkething, calculated to help them over all difficulties and re-establish them completely. In October, 1912, the Government submitted to Parliament a bill for the change of the constitution, corresponding with the program of the Left, which called for general and equal suffrage and abolished privileged election rights. The party asked all other democratic parties to support this

bill. As a co-operation of all democratic parties was necessary to carry it through, and as the Socialists realized that they could not gain their other demands, they, as well as the Radical Left, gave their support. The Conservatives, of course, fought this bill . . . [but] at the elections to the Folkething, May 20, 1913 . . . the Left, the Radicals, and the Socialists, each with their own candidates, supported [it.] Election results showed that the Left had retained [but] 44 seats, while the Socialists rose to 32 and those of the Radical Left to 31. The Conservatives found that their numbers had been reduced from 14 to 7 seats. . . .

“The losses suffered by the party of the Left induced it to withdraw from the Government, but it promised to assist further with the suffrage bill. The leader of the Socialists, as the largest element in the Folkething, was called before the king and he was offered the formation of the government—perhaps in connection with the Radical Left wing. This petition he refused, explaining that a party of the Left could be formed which would have the necessary majority in the Folkething. The Left would not hear of this. The Radical Left then declared itself ready, after consultations with the Socialists, to form the government and to make the revision of the constitution its most important task.

“In September, 1913, the new government submitted the bill, which the Left had drawn up, and which had been sanctioned by the Folkething before the last election. This bill was again accepted by the Folkething and the discussions with the Landsting [the Upper House] began. The strength of the Conservatives in the Landsting had been reduced to 34 members. The so-called constitutional parties, the 3 democratic parties, had 32 representatives.

“It was rumored that the Landsting would be dissolved in order to bring about a ‘constitutional majority,’ when

Estrup, who had carried through the privileged election law of 1866, died, and a Liberal was elected in his place. As the Conservatives appoint the president, and as he has no vote, 33 votes of the constitutional parties opposed 32 Conservative votes.

“Under the pressure of this situation, the preparations in this matter have been completed and the members of the three constitutional parties will recommend to Parliament a bill which will give to Denmark one of the freest constitutions in the world.

“The contents of the bill are as follows:

“The bi-cameral system will be retained, but both Houses will be elected by general suffrage.

“The age of voters for the Folkething is 25 years (formerly 30). Women and servants, who have hitherto been excluded, get the vote. The election to the Folke-thing takes place in 120 individual districts, and, besides this, all participating parties get a share of the supplementary seats (20), according to the votes cast in their favor. In this way each party will get a fair deal.

“The same general and equal suffrage will be carried through for the elections to the Landsting. The age of the voters has to be 35 years, but the present voters of 30 to 35 retain their election rights. The women and servants also get the suffrage for the Landsting. The manner of election is the same as formerly, through electors.

“Neither a tax qualification nor any kind of privilege exists at the elections. In contrast to the present suffrage, this means a mighty advance. The political power of the privileged class, which they have had on account of money and property, disappears. Three-fourths of a million citizens, men and women between 25 and 30 get the vote, and the representation of the election districts in the towns and in the country is equally divided. If everything goes as

calculated, the new constitution will be carried through in a very short time. By its means the working-class of Denmark faces a better future.”

2. THE EFFECT OF THE WAR ON THE SUFFRAGE

(Correspondence of *Vorwaerts*, Copenhagen, October 1, 1914)

“After a victorious election for the Landsthing (Senate), the constitutional reform which brings to all men and women universal, equal, and direct suffrage, which had absorbed the strength of all political parties throughout the year, was brought to a conclusion. Our party and the radical Left (progressives) had obtained a majority in the election of the Folkething (Parliament), by means of which, in spite of our refusal to take part in the government, the way had become free for election reform, when the war gave the Conservative majority of the Landsthing the welcome opportunity to lay aside temporarily this very unwelcome business, on the ground of threatening external dangers, and to wait for more peaceful times.

“The progressive government was now forced to occupy itself with the task created by the war. That in these critical times a radical government is at the helm, which is strictly dependent upon the Social Democrats, was of the greatest importance both in internal and external affairs, especially for the working-people. The peaceful intentions of this government are just as sincere as our own, so that the party under present conditions gives it all possible support. We decided to do our best to keep the present officials of the Government in power, and for this reason the Socialist group voted in favor of the proposed military measures, and in favor of a loan of 10,000,000 kronen.”

V. THE POLITICAL SITUATION IN DENMARK

By Gustav Bang

“The Danish constitution, in its present form, was passed in 1866, at a time when the proletariat was entirely undeveloped, when the class consciousness of the farming population was still in its infancy, when the great landowners had nevertheless already begun to fear our opposition. It was a time exceedingly favorable for reactionary measures; the unsuccessful war of 1864 had brought in its wake a deep nation-wide depression, and had resulted at the same time in the complete downfall of the liberalism of the more intelligent classes. The great landholders found but little difficulty in pushing through a constitution that reflects clearly their own class interests. As under the previous constitution, the new legislature consisted of two houses practically co-ordinate in importance and power. The new constitution differed, however, from that of 1849 by virtue of the fact that it applied the principle of universal suffrage only to the election of the Lower House, whereas the former constitution applied it to both Houses. The *Folkething* was elected by the general vote of all men of good character, over 30 years of age (servants excepted), and all votes were of equal importance, aside from the difference made by the varying size of the election districts.

“The *Landsting*, on the other hand, is controlled by the wealthy classes and the landowners. Of its 66 members, 12 are appointed by the Government, while the other 54 are elected by a complicated system based upon a clever admixture of universal and privilege suffrage laws. In Copenhagen an income of more than 4,000 crowns (about \$1,000), in the provinces more than 2,000 crowns (about \$500), being necessary to a voter of the first class. These well-to-do voters first vote together with the others for

one-half of the electors, then alone for the other half; these electors, in turn, electing the remaining members of the Landstthing. In the country districts the wealthy enjoy even greater political privileges. Here a number of wealthy landowners, as many in number as there are townships in the election districts, meet, as members in their own right, with the elected members of the board of electors. In this way every landholder has in the Landstthing an influence equal to that of all the citizens of his township taken together. In the country districts, therefore, the wealthy are greatly benefited by the apportionment of the election districts, which assures the domination of the rich over the poor, and makes the big landowners the political masters of the urban population.

“Here are two extreme cases. In the last general elections to the Landstthing in 1906 and 1910, 1,111 landowners and wealthy farmers elected 19 members, while 61,659 Copenhagen voters, who owned less than 4,000 crowns, elected only 3. This system has steadily become more unbearable. The two Houses are in constant conflict. Representing the interests of two entirely different classes of people, they necessarily stand in frank opposition to each other upon every important question. The capitalist Landstthing has always used its advantage in a most brutal manner, in order either to block entirely the measures passed by the Folkething, or at least to rob them as far as possible of all practical value.

“With one stroke this whole situation was changed, when on October 23, 1912, the prime minister, Klaus Berntsen, presented to the Folkething a bill providing for a new constitution, absolutely democratic in character, at the same time warning the Conservatives that this measure would not be dropped from the order of business, that he would brook no compromise, and that its principles must

be adopted in their entirety. Various motives may have prompted this action on the part of a representative of the Liberals, who, up to this time, had shown but little interest in political reform. The strongest was, beyond doubt, a vague fear of the coming election—after a session in which taxes, and especially indirect taxes, had been screwed up to an unprecedented height in order to cover great military expenditures. The ruling party had been steadily losing its ground with the lower farming population and feared, not without just cause, a terrible downfall. There was only one possibility, an active campaign against the privileged landowners, a return to power under a new democratic standard, with the votes of a great mass of the people.

“Whatever the motives may have been, to us they are of interest only in so far as they will influence the passage of the bill. The measure itself is a great step forward from the conditions existing under the present constitution. It increases the number of voters for the Folkething by granting a vote not only to servants but also to women, and by reducing the minimum age from 30 to 25 years. The Landsting is to be elected by city and town boards. As practically all men and women over 25 years of age have the right to vote in municipal elections, with the exception of Copenhagen, where only taxpayers are voters, the Landsting also will become more democratic, and will be elected, although, in a different manner from the Folke-thing, by the vote of the people. It will thus become a more reliable expression of the will of the population. . . .

“Needless to say, we are by no means entirely satisfied with the bill as it stands. The political demands of our program go a great deal further. But, on the whole, it represents such a striking improvement, and will be followed by so great an increase of our power, that we have

promised the Government—after the party had given its unanimous consent—to support the bill in its present form. The same course was taken by the Radical Party, which represents the intelligent element of Copenhagen. So it was that the amendment was passed in December, with 95 votes against 12 in the Folkething, and then went on to the Landsthing, where the Conservatives hold a small majority of seats, 34 out of 66. The amendment precipitated a veritable panic among the Conservatives, for it put an end to the beautiful era of compromise that had enabled them, with the help of the Liberals, to force their will upon the Government. They tried every conceivable means to force the Ministry out of office, to cloud the whole situation, but in vain. When they saw there was no way out of it, and were forced to present substitutes and amendments, they became completely helpless. They published not one, but a number of bills, some of which were absolutely senseless, bills that contradicted each other, that had but one feature in common—the substitution of new property qualifications for the old. And when at last, on April 3, the original bill went before the Landsting for its second reading, the whole discussion was cut short by the adoption of a resolution. The fight between the Ministry and the Landsting was on in earnest. But as the Folkething election was almost due—its term ended on the twentieth of May—the Government decided to let the voters speak. The election became a sort of referendum for and against the constitutional amendment of the Government. The whole campaign centered on this question. Our propaganda was, naturally, radically influenced by the entire situation. As we here have no by-elections, it was to be feared that a splitting up of the votes among Liberals, Socialists, and Radicals would make possible the election of a Conservative in a great many districts. We decided, therefore, to re-

frain from nominating candidates in a number of districts, where we usually polled a large vote, and called upon our comrades to support the Liberal or the Radical candidates. We did this with a light heart, for we used this campaign for active Socialist propaganda and showed, in no measured terms, the difference between the Social Democracy and the others, even where we went hand in hand with them. Everywhere we emphasized the importance of political reform for the future of the Socialist movement.

“On May 29 the election for the Folkething was held. Its results were very favorable. . . . We had held 24 districts out of 114. Of these we lost 4, but this loss was made good by the gain of 12 new districts, making a net gain of 8 districts. This represents an increase of the number of Socialist representatives from 24 to 32. Our vote also increased from 98,718, in 1910, to 107,365. Thirty per cent of all voters voted for the Socialist ticket. We are to-day the largest party; the Liberals, who held the first place, fell to 100,894 votes. The two other parties, the Conservative and the Radical, fell far below this number. We gained this result, although we nominated candidates in only 68 out of 114 districts. Had the Socialist voters of the other 46 districts had the opportunity of voting as Socialists, our total would have been much larger. Our success in the country districts was particularly gratifying—almost half of the Socialist districts were agricultural. The election showed plainly that the small farmers and farm hands are coming to us in steadily growing numbers. . . .

“The following figures will show how steadily the Socialist Party has grown in the last 18 years, after the enforcement of the election laws, in comparison with the other parties whose votes fluctuated from election to election.

	Votes	Districts		Votes	Districts
1895.....	24,510	8	1906.....	76,612	24
1898.....	31,870	12	1909.....	93,079	24
1901.....	43,015	14	1910.....	98,718	24
1903.....	55,989	16	1913.....	107,365	32

“The outlook for the proposed amendment was most promising. Hardly a quarter of the vote cast had been polled by the Conservatives against the bill proposed by the Government. More than three-quarters were cast for the three parties that supported the demand for universal suffrage. The Conservatives lost 6 of their original 13 districts. . . . The 7 Conservatives, when the election was over, stood opposed to 107 Liberal, Socialist, and Radical members, all of whom were pledged to political reform. The amendment had received an overwhelming ratification. It is true the Liberal Party had lost votes. . . . [They] fell from 57 to 44, while the Socialists won 32, the Radicals 31 seats. But the Liberal Party was still the strongest of the three parties that had united to introduce political reform, and the other two parties had promised them their unqualified support. . . . With the tremendous majority pledged to its support, the whole question should have been settled in a few months’ time. . . .

“But opposition began immediately. A part of the Liberal Party declared, as soon as the election was over, that their party, because of its numerical loss, was no longer entitled to control the Government. They demanded that the Social Democrats and the Radicals, who, together, constituted the majority in the Folkething, form a new Ministry. They demanded this with such insistence that the Ministry was forced . . . to resign. . . .

“[This development] was due to the peculiar class interests of the Liberal farmers, . . . who form the chief element of the Liberal Party [and] are not greatly interested

in maintaining the present constitution—since they themselves are shut out from the qualified election rights to the Landsting. On the other hand, they fear the danger that lurks in general suffrage, because they know that in a few years the far greater number of small farmers and workers will control both houses of the national legislature. . . .

“If the Liberals had entered the Folkething with so large a majority that they could have formed an alliance with either Conservatives or Socialists, as it pleased them, this would have given them an opportunity to come to some sort of a compromise by dealing with both sides. Thus they might have hindered, at least in a measure, the growth of proletarian influence upon the Government. As matters stood this was out of the question. This was probably the reason that led the Liberals to refuse to take the leadership in the question of political reform.

“This was the situation in the Social Democratic Party when the problem of accepting a position in the Ministry presented itself. In 1909 the party had adopted a resolution which forbade, under all circumstances, the election of a Socialist into a capitalist Ministry. Had we considered the possibility of forming a coalition Ministry with the Radicals, it would have been necessary to call a special party convention. . . . The chairman of our party, Stauning, who upon several occasions was called to confer with the king, declared, by instruction from the Socialist Parliamentary group and the Executive Committee of our National Committee, that we believed it to be in the best interests of political reform that the late [Liberal] Ministry be reinstated. The suggestion that we form a Socialist, or a Coalition Ministry, was emphatically repudiated. One possibility was seriously considered by the Socialist members: whether it were possible to enter into

a Ministry formed by all three parties, whose only duty should be to push through the suffrage amendment. We all recognized that such an experiment was exceedingly hazardous, and it was doubtful whether we should receive the indorsement of the party convention. On the other hand, the practical question at issue here [the suffrage amendment] is of the highest significance for the future of the party, and it is absolutely necessary that the three parties work together to enforce its speedy realization. For both the Folkething and the Landsting must be dissolved and re-elected before the reform becomes a law, and small disharmonies between the three parties may help the Conservatives to win, thus cutting off for many years to come every possibility for election reform. But as the Liberals emphatically refused to participate in such a 'Triple Entente,' the whole thing was out of the question. . . . A purely Radical Ministry was elected.

"The new Ministry under Zahle is at the present time occupied solely with the passage of the proposed amendment [which] . . . will be settled before the budget discussions begin. Then the bill will be submitted to the Landsting, and we will wait to see whether Conservatives have become less stiffnecked, or whether they will open up the fight once more by a second refusal to pass the bill. Of course the Social Democracy will give the Ministry its full support; but the Liberals, too, are so undeniably bound up with the amendment that they dare not repudiate it, so that we need hardly fear a betrayal from this quarter. The consequences for them would be a terrible downfall, when next they come to their voters for support. Nothing can dam up the flood of political reform once it has been started."

SWEDEN

VI. INTRODUCTORY

The Swedish Party has now been in existence for 25 years. Founded in 1889, with a membership of 3,000, it advanced slowly during the first few years, and reached its maximum in 1907. As the party is based on the trade-unions, the crisis commencing in that year, and the consequences of the general strike of 1909, reduced its membership along with that of the unions. It was at its lowest point in 1910, with 55,248 members, and stands now at about 70,000. (*Justice.*)

The growth of the vote is shown in the following table:

	Vote	Members of Parliament
1902.....	8,751	4
1905.....	26,083	17
1908.....	54,004	33
1911.....	172,000	64
1914.....	230,000	73
1914 (September).....	257,000	87

It is to be noted that the suffrage was greatly extended in 1911, and the total number of members of Parliament increased from 165 to 230. So the increase of the Socialist vote and of Socialist members elected has been a steady one. There are 519 representatives on the town and borough councils, and about 3,000 on the village or parish councils. As to the district or county councils, the party has 182 members, in spite of the enormous handicap of the plural vote in force for these councils.

VII. SOCIALISTS FAVOR A REPUBLIC

In 1912 the Socialist leader, Lindhagen, introduced a bill in Parliament to abolish the monarchy. Another

leader, Branting, opposed the introduction of the motion.

Lindhagen, in supporting his measure, said among other things that the differences in the Socialist groups arose from the fact that Branting and his faction went upon the materialist conception of history and wanted to wait until the time was ripe, while he was of the opinion that the ideas of men could be affected in such a way as to bring about this ripeness.

After a short debate the measure was lost by a vote of 118 to 12. There were at this time 65 Socialist members of Parliament.

VIII. THE SWEDISH PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS OF 1914

(From *Vorwaerts*)

1. THE ELECTION APPEAL

“The Executive Committee of the Swedish Socialist Party has published in its party press a manifesto to the people of Sweden . . . which points out the position of the Socialist Party. It first confirms the fact that the king’s speech to the peasants . . . demanded armament policies differing from those which the Government desired, [and] that through this defiant personal interference of the king the administration of 1911 had dissolved, and that a new one had to be called. This latter cabinet was ordered to uphold the royal decree, either by means of promises or pressure.

“The appeal further characterizes the agitation of the armament agitators as being in effect as follows: ‘The voters should, at least once before the general elections in the autumn, wage an election fight, in which every weapon should be used, including terror and pressure, lies and slander, in order to change public opinion, if possible, and

to make the people a willing footstool to the king and to the capitalistic powers.'

"The election fight is waged either for or against the personal power of the king. . . .

"To a challenge of this king the only answer the people can give is that no other than the will of the people shall rule. It must be settled once for all whether, in our country, [the Government] can . . . be again suddenly interrupted . . . in its work because it pleases royalty to . . . declare that 'he does not share such an opinion' and that he will not swerve from certain demands.

"That part of the appeal which deals with the armament question is of special interest. It states . . . that influential Liberal papers boasted that their military program hardly differed from that of the Conservatives. . . . The promise by the Liberals of a decrease in the high cost of living is, seen in this light, nothing more than mere words. The Conservatives . . . demand one year of military service, a fleet, and a hundred million yearly budget for armament purposes, as a result of which not only the taxation laws and the increased cost of living will be perpetuated, but social reform will become an impossibility.

"The Socialist Party, on the other hand, wishes to do away with the existing weaknesses in the country's defense by arming the reserves, increasing the marine, and by adding torpedo and submarine boats instead of the crazy 'F boats,' which cost fifteen million apiece, but which are not suited to oppose the large giants of other sea powers. A decrease . . . in expenditures by shortening the time of military service to six instead of eight months is also demanded. . . . Instead of expending eighty million kronen, this plan called for seventy million only. This expense . . . would have to come out of an armament tax levied upon the well-to-do classes.

“The appeal closes: ‘Good prospects everywhere for the Socialist candidates. May the red vote increase enormously. May a stronger Socialist parliamentary fraction constitute the answer of the people to the challenge of the king and to the ill-considered military program of the royal government.’

“The appeal was signed by every member of the Executive committee, as well as by those who had stood for a purely negative program in regard to the question of the country’s defense. The unity and solidarity of the party in the past struggles have gone on record and success is certain.”

Results

	1911		1914	
	Seats	Votes	Seats	Votes
Conservatives	65	189,000	86	286,000
Liberals	101	243,000	71	245,000
Socialists	64	172,000	73	230,000

2. RESULTS OF THE ELECTIONS

By Hjalmar Branting, Stockholm

(From *Vorwaerts*)

“. . . The three parties divided amongst themselves the voting population—of which this time 72 per cent voted in contrast to 75 per cent in 1911—so that the Socialists have now 30 per cent, in all 230,000 votes; the Liberals a little more than 32 per cent, 245,000 votes, and the Conservatives about 37½ per cent, with votes in round figures of 285,000. The respective figures in 1911 were as follows: 28.5 per cent, 40.2 per cent, and 31.5 per cent. The actual voting increase of the Socialists amounted to 57,000; of the Liberals, 2,000; of the Conservatives, however, to about 98,000. . . .

“It can be said that the increase of the Conservatives

turned out to be larger than seemed at first probable. The position of the Liberals in the peasant provinces of Middle and North Sweden was weaker than [was] expected. . . . The clerical influence in certain parts of the country is not to be undervalued. The priests and ministers in those secluded parts, all imbued with a strange Finnish sectarianism, called *Lastadianism*, had spread the tale that the Socialists were preparing a general slaughter of Christians. In the southern part of the same election district, which reaches as far north as the Bottisch gulf, women agitators visited the peasants and asked whether they really intended to dethrone the king, because he wished to protect them against the Russians. In spite of all this agitation our comrades won in these districts two out of the three seats. The Liberals, however, were completely defeated. . . . The Swedish nation, by a vote of 475,000 as against only 285,000, declared itself opposed to the armament program of the king and his government . . .”

3. OBSERVATIONS BY BRANTING

(Interview in *The Daily Citizen* of London)

“ ‘The election,’ he said, ‘was very short, but very intense. The military question dominated everything, and I must tell you at once that the manner in which the Conservatives conducted the fight was most scandalous. Their plan was a concentrated scare. “The Cossacks had landed!” “The Russians were at the gates of Stockholm!” and so on, in the most extravagant fashion. Of course that was intended to sweep the waverers into their camp.

“ ‘Well, the Socialist Party made great efforts to resist this panic, and succeeded, I think, for you see we have

captured nine new seats. That is good. They are mostly from the Liberals, who have, however, paid the heaviest toll to the Conservatives.

“ ‘One thing I must explain to you is this: The election just concluded in no way interferes with the triennial election which comes on in the autumn of this year.’ ”

“ ‘How do you find your system of proportional representation working?’ ”

“ ‘It was used for the first time in 1911,’ replied Herr Branting, ‘and increased the electorate by 600,000. The Socialist Party’s experience of it has been very good.’ ”

“ ‘In reply to a question about future policy the Socialist leader said that they were pledged to the general Socialist program, the betterment of conditions of labor. They were striving for an eight-hour day. They were in favor of the full enfranchisement of women, and as the evolution of democracy proceeded they would be more and more successful. Meanwhile the armaments and the related constitutional question overshadowed everything in Sweden.

“ ‘Sweden, he pointed out, has a total population less than that of London—5,500,000 to be exact, of whom 1,500,000 are adult men. Yet there are more than 150,000 workers organized, and more than 70,000 members of the Social Democratic Party.

“ ‘We have,’ he said, ‘nine Socialist daily papers with splendid circulations. Our Labor and Socialist press has been our most important weapon. These papers rose from small beginnings and gradually helped us to make the organization, and now the organization is “making” the papers. We would not be without our Socialist press, for we have found that if ever we discontinued any one of them there was lost ground.’ ”

.

IX. THE QUESTION OF A COALITION MINISTRY

The elections of September, 1914, showed a most remarkable increase of Socialist votes over those cast in the spring. The victory of the Socialists in the September elections made them the largest party in Sweden, giving them over one-third of the members of the Parliament, and brought up the question of a possible coalition Ministry, to consist of Socialists and Liberals, to go into effect at the end of the war. On October the 7th the party Executive voted:

That it was the duty of the largest party of the Left to take the initiative in negotiations with the Liberal Party. It should be inquired what is the possibility of a program of the Left in respect to work for democratic and social political reform, which is expected by the electorate and must be begun with all energy as soon as the present war crisis is ended. . . . Should coalitions be formed which assure a democratic majority in the second chamber, the party Executive believes that our party must draw the necessary parliamentary conclusions. . . . The party Executive recommends to the party Congress that a definite union for immediate reform work be made with the Liberal Party under these conditions.

The previous year, 1913, had brought forth the consideration of the coalition government in Holland and Denmark, but the proposal was refused by the Socialists in both countries. Its acceptance by the Swedish Socialist Congress on December 1 is the more remarkable and important, constituting, as it does, a reversion to the position taken by Jaurès and certain Socialist groups in France and other countries before the International Congress at Amsterdam endeavored finally to put an end to all coalition governments except under very extraordinary circumstances.

X. THE PARTY CONGRESS OF 1915

(From *Vorwaerts*, Summarized by Wm. E. Bohn, in *International Socialist Review*, February, 1915)

"The party decided at this Congress to take part in a coalition government with non-Socialist parties—after the war. In Sweden the Socialists are now the strongest party in the Lower House of Parliament. They have 87 votes, the Conservatives 86, and the Liberals 45. The situation is a tempting one for the party leaders. The new cabinet must be made up either of Socialists or Conservatives. By combining with the Liberals the Socialists can have the naming of the chief ministers and a chief part in drawing up a government program. . . .

"The party Congress met at Stockholm during the last days of November. There were two important matters up for discussion, militarism and participation in the government. Action on both matters went the same way. . . .

"The party program demanded a progressive reduction of expenditures for army and navy to the point of disarmament. It was charged that the Socialist deputies had not lived up to the requirements of this program. . . . We cannot disarm, [they] said in effect, before disarmament is brought about by international agreement. This position was approved by a vote of 70 to 61.

"With regard to participation in the government there was a sharp discussion. . . . But the party Executive Committee, represented by Branting, carried the day . . . by a vote of 90 to 58. In accordance with [their] proposal the Socialist deputies are to meet the Liberals and attempt to draw up a common program. If they succeed in doing this they will be at liberty to form a cabinet made up of representatives of the two parties."

XI. THE ELECTIONS OF 1915

(From *Vorwaerts*)

“The number of members of the Socialist Party of Sweden increased from 75,444 to 84,410—almost 9,000. Four hundred and twenty-six party members were elected to city councils against 360 in the preceding year, and the number of county representatives increased from 442 to 754. The influence of the party can also be noticed in other directions. Four thousand seven hundred and ninety-five are active in municipal corporations, on school boards, etc., compared with 2,691 in the preceding year.”

NORWAY

XII. THE GENERAL POSITION OF THE SOCIALIST MOVEMENT IN
NORWAY

In the 1915 election the participation of the women increased the vote in Norway to 612,000 votes. This meant an increase of 108,000 votes over those cast in former elections. One hundred and ninety-eight thousand votes were cast for the Left, 196,000 for the Social Democrats, 186,000 for the Right and the Liberals, 26,000 for the Labor Democrats, and 6,000 for representatives of other parties. In 1894 there were but 732 Socialist voters in the country.

The Socialist vote recorded the largest increase. Their vote increased about 55 per cent. The Left and the Labor Democrats together had an increase of 15 per cent, the Socialists 40 per cent, and the Right as well as the Liberals only 5 to 6 per cent. The Government Party, however, remained secure in its majority. The party of the Right lost in the first election three of its election districts.

The new Storthing is composed of 21 members of the Right and Liberals as compared with 21 in the last Storthing; 78 members of the Left and Labor Democrats, as against 76 in the last Storthing; 20 Social Democrats as against 23, and 4 deputies representing no special party.

SOCIALISTS IN THE STORTHING

Years	Socialist Representatives	Socialist Votes
1894.....	..	732
1897.....	..	947
1900.....	..	7,013
1903.....	4	24,526
1906.....	10	43,100
1909.....	11	91,268
1912.....	23	120,077
1915.....	20	196,000

In the municipal council of Christiania, 29 of the 84 members are Socialists, and of these 3 are women.

In the beginning of 1914 the Socialist Party claimed a membership of 50,000, an increase of 6,000 over the previous year. The principal organ was the *Sozialdemokraten*, published in Christiania, with a circulation of 31,000. It is estimated that 103,783 people of Norway subscribed in 1914 to the 8 Socialist dailies and 18 weeklies.

CHAPTER IX

AUSTRIA AND HUNGARY

AUSTRIA

I. INTRODUCTORY

SOCIALISM was not organized in Austria until the late 'eighties and it was only in 1901 that it made its appearance in the Reichsrath with 10 deputies. In January, 1907, a law was passed giving the vote to all men over 24. This law produced its inevitable fruit at the general elections held in the following May, when 87 Socialist deputies were elected to a house of 516 and the Socialist vote was 1,041,948, or nearly one-third of the total. The popular Socialist vote increased in 1911 to 1,081,000, but the number of deputies was reduced to 82—still more than one-sixth of the total number.

II. THE PERILS OF REFORMISM

By Otto Bauer, Vienna

(In *Die Neue Zeit*)

“The Convention of the Social Democracy of Austria, which met in Vienna in . . . November, 1913, merits the attention of our comrades outside the Austrian boundaries. . . . Though its [the Austrian proletarian's] development be radically different from the normal, straightforward progress made in other countries whose people are not divided by prejudices of nationality and race, never-

theless our Convention was controlled by the same great question that has for years been the basis of earnest discussion in all international congresses and national conventions of the International Social Democracy: the struggle between reform and revolutionary Socialism.

"The appearance of this question . . . has been forced upon us by bitter political experience. Up to the year 1904 the Austrian Social Democracy was a small organization. From 1904 to 1907 it grew by leaps and bounds. This period of prosperity encouraged a rapid growth of the labor-union movement; their number increased . . . from 189,000 to 501,000. Countless strikes won for them higher wages, shorter hours, and more favorable contracts. These splendid successes on the industrial field went hand in hand with remarkable political victories.

"The Hungarian military conflict, that forced the Crown to threaten the House of Lords with the introduction of universal suffrage, encouraged the Austrian laboring-class to take up the struggle for the right to vote. The Russian revolution added strength and fervor to the movement. Together with the Crown and the bureaucracy, the proletariat put an end to the power of the ancient feudal nobility and the bourgeoisie.

"These victories brought numberless new recruits to the Socialist movement. But their ideals . . . were thoroughly reformistic. They had been won for the party by the popularity of our victories of 1904-1907. They expected an endless chain of similar victories. They looked to the new Parliament, elected by the votes of all the people, with the most extravagant hopes. . . . The proletariat hoped that the successful climax of their struggle for a general equal ballot would usher in an era of social reforms, would make possible a rapid, peaceful union of all proletarian forces, and would bring with it the gradual

undermining of capitalist society. . . . But here, as elsewhere, these hopes met with bitter disappointment.

“The industrial prosperity of the people suddenly vanished. . . . In 1908 we suffered a severe industrial crisis. . . .

“Since 1907 the increase in wages, even of the steadily employed worker, has been much less than the increase of prices and rents. A large part of the laboring-class has lost what it gained in former years, its shorter hours, its better pay, and tens of thousands have been unemployed for many months.

“Into these years of terrible sufferings came the disastrous turn of affairs in our foreign political relation. . . . Twice within four years a large part of our army was mobilized. In the last year tens of thousands of reserves, tens of thousands of fathers stood, for eight months on the Servian border. Militaristic agitation set in with redoubled force. . . . With these happenings came a change in the attitude of the ruling classes toward the Social Democracy. Where the party of the working-class, in 1905 and 1906, had been a welcome ally to the Crown against the privilege Parliament, now as the only firm opponent of imperialism and militarism it became the Crown’s bitter enemy. Government and judiciary became more brutal to the working-class than ever before.

“Parliament was helpless before these new developments. The introduction of universal, equal suffrage had deepened and complicated the struggle between the Austrian nations. Nations that had been voiceless under the old laws, after the suffrage became democratic, entered, with their full strength, into the political arena—this was the case with the Ruthenians and the Slovenians. The past years had increased their self-confidence. . . . These small peoples could not hope to win a majority for their

demands in the Parliament, so they used the weapon of obstruction. . . . The large nations, however,—the Germans, the Tchechs, and the Poles—did not dare to deprive them of this weapon. For not one of these has a majority in the Parliament, and each trembles at the possibility of being overpowered by a coalition of its enemies. Each party, therefore, desires to hold fast, as a last resource, this possibility of obstruction. . . . Parliament was powerless in the hands of two dozen Ruthenians or Slovenians. . . . So it finally devolved upon the bureaucracy to take matters into its own hands. In accordance with the notorious paragraph 14 of the fundamental state law, the latter passed laws without the consent of the Reichsrath.

“But even at those times when Parliament was not weakened by obstruction it was anything but the body that the proletariat masses had expected. In Austria, as elsewhere, the class lines have developed very rapidly. . . . The tendency toward a union of forces on the part of the possessing classes against the proletariat was strengthened by the election reform. Where, formerly, they had struggled and battled with each other with impunity, they now saw only their common enemy, the Social Democracy. With the exception of a handful of Progressives, the other parties all united against us. Every attempt to force workingmen’s protective legislation upon this Parliament met with a determined opposition of the united capitalist forces. . . .

“Matters had come to a crisis that was entirely unlooked for on the part of the masses. Instead of an era of ‘positive results’ of social reform, instead of an ‘undermining of capitalism,’ there came an epoch of high prices, an industrial crisis, increased armaments, a mobilization of forces, and nationalist obstruction on the one hand,

and on the other absolutism, a coalition of capitalist parties, the complete failure of all social legislation.

“The people now hoped to meet this new development with clever tactical moves. . . . It was the common belief that co-operation between Crown and the International Socialist movement against the bourgeois nationalist forces was still a possibility. . . . But the Crown had deserted the cause of democracy, had made peace with the feudal nobility of Hungary, had dropped its fight for election reform, and established the dictatorship of Tisza. Imperialism and militarism . . . have forced the organized working-class into active opposition to the policies of its rulers. These facts have badly shaken the popular faith in the possibility of renewing the political relations of 1905 and 1906. . . .

“Powerless to change the course of political events by their own actions [violent revolts against high cost of living], the masses once more pinned their whole faith to their parliamentary representatives. They still believed that the expected reforms must materialize, if only their representatives would use the right methods. . . .

“The district organizations of Vienna—Meidling and Graz—presented resolutions to the party Convention demanding that the parliamentary group should not be satisfied with mere opposition, but should obstruct the measures of the Government, especially the military bill, until an old-age and invalid pension as well as several other important social and political reforms had been secured. The debate that followed showed plainly that this conception had taken root in the minds of a large number of our party members. . . .

“The party Executive Board and the deputies were opposed. They showed the situation in Austria as it is to-day. The long years of obstruction in the Bohemian

Landtag . . . has brought, in place of popular rule by the national government, a system of bureaucratic absolutism. A similar change is taking place in Galicia. It will be but a matter of years before government by commission, appointed by the administration, will take the place of the popular Landtag, in all states where there are a number of nationalities represented. Just as obstruction has been the forerunner of absolutism in the states, so it will be in the nation. No parliament can rule when to-day this, and to-morrow that party hinders all work. . . .

“Hitherto obstruction has been used only in nationalist conflicts. Its use by the Social Democrats would make it a weapon in the class struggle. Every class would then adopt its use—to-day the worker, to-morrow the middle-class man; to-day the agrarian, to-morrow the capitalist. The nationalistic obstruction alone was strong enough to disrupt Parliament, to pave the way for paragraph 14. Social political obstruction would completely destroy Parliament, would fix absolutism firmly in the saddle. . . .

“The Convention accepted, after a long debate, a resolution presented by the delegates of German Bohemia, that condemned obstruction as a normal weapon in the struggle for reforms, and declared its use permissible only in extreme cases of parliamentary self-defense.

“Important as this ruling of the Party Convention doubtless is, . . . much more important to our movement was the debate itself, fixing our attitude toward parliamentarism and toward the whole capitalist state. The whole discussion showed that it is insane to believe that positive results, social reforms, the undermining of the whole capitalist system can be accomplished by skillful tactics and clever political tricks. It affirmed that it is the duty of the party to lead the great masses, blinded by the victories of 1904-1907, back to our old Marxian

principles, to show them that capitalist evolution does not mean a gradual and peaceful improvement of conditions, but rather growing poverty, sharper class-lines, increased exploitation, until we are strong enough to overthrow the whole world of capital. . . .

“This change in our attitude toward capitalism as a whole marks, at the same time, a change in our attitude toward the Austrian state. The frenzy of our victory for election reform implanted into the heads of our comrades the idea that Austria could be made a sort of model nation, a second Switzerland, a country that would show to the world that eight nations could live together in peace and freedom under the roof of one government. . . . The destructive interior struggles of recent years, the Balkan catastrophe that lost Austria its recognition as a European power, these have effectually rid our members of this false hope. This party Convention showed for the first time how completely popular faith in the future of Austria has been shattered.

“The period of the revolution of the past has built national states upon the wrecks of old feudal and absolute state formations. It has established Austria as the sum total of a great many national units that were left unannexed in the general nationalization process of the times. It is uncertain whether this Austria will become a united nation of free states, welded together by the revolutions of the future, or whether it will disintegrate and its nations fall under the power of other stronger nationalities. In other countries it may seem possible that the proletariat will gradually grow, by a peaceable evolution, until it is ripe to take into its hands the whole industrial machinery. In our country, however, it is clear that the national government, of which we wish to take possession, must first be amalgamated. . . .

"To be sure, these are not new discoveries. In Austria there have always been comrades who warned against the reform tendencies, who tried to educate the masses in revolutionary thought. But in the past their words fell on deaf ears. The Party Convention showed that at last our party membership was beginning to awake to the dangers of reform tactics. . . . It showed the danger of awakening in the masses extravagant hopes of 'positive success,' showed that they would lay the blame for their suffering not upon the capitalist system, but upon the Social Democratic Party. . . .

"True, it will not be easy to teach the great working-class to change its manner of thinking. It will need years of education. . . . That the first step toward this task was taken by the Convention of Vienna gives it a peculiar significance in the party history of the Austrian movement. For this reason it merits the attention of our comrades outside our boundaries. . . . Our country has often been called the model of international reformism, the Austrian Socialists have enjoyed the reputation of being the leaders of the revisionist movement in the International. Well then, Austria has demonstrated to the whole International the dangers of following a policy of 'nothing but reform' agitation. May our experience be a lesson and a warning to our comrades in other countries."

HUNGARY

I. INTRODUCTORY

The suffrage in Hungary is so restricted that the 85,000 Socialist votes cast do not give an adequate idea of the strength of the movement. A better measure is the fact that the Socialists have 136 members in municipal councils. The membership of the party is also narrowly re-

stricted by hostile legislation, but its recent growth is well indicated in the 1913 report of the Party Congress.

The trade-unions, which form the backbone of the party, increased their membership from 95,180 to 111,966 [in 1913]. The number of members in the unions paying the party dues rose from 52,733 to 59,623. The party organ, *Nepszava*, for the first time in its existence, showed a surplus.

II. CONGRESS OF THE HUNGARIAN SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY, 1913

By E. Varga, Budapest

(From *Die Neue Zeit*)

“On October 30 the Hungarian Social Democratic Party met for its twentieth convention. A review of the history of the Hungarian labor movement and the Social Democratic Party, as presented in a small six-page booklet that has just been published, may well justify a feeling of pride in our work. In a country that is economically and culturally far beneath the standard of other European nations, . . . we have still succeeded, by untiring agitation and organization, in rallying a large part of the working-class under the standard of our movement. The last ten years, particularly, show rapid development.

“The growth of the Social Democratic press is more than gratifying. The income of the *Nepszava* and the *Volksstimme* alone has increased tenfold in the last ten years. The past year has seen active work in the improvement and circulation of our papers. A number of weeks ago a new paper, printed in the German and Hungarian tongue, called the *Bergarbeiter* (The Miner) made its first appearance. This is dedicated to the organization of the miners of Hungary, about 100,000 strong.

“Besides these party successes, the co-operative societies have increased their business tenfold in the last five years. An attempt has been made to organize co-operative farming societies, patterned after those of Italy, with a difference, however. While in Italy these societies enjoy the support and assistance of the administration, here every attempt to organize farm-workers meets with vehement opposition from the ruling class and its class government.

“From the historical point of view we have no reason to complain of the Hungarian movement. But one look at its present situation shows a different picture. A heavy industrial crisis has been resting upon the country since the outbreak of the Balkan war. The constant danger of war for more than a year has injured all industrial and commercial enterprise. Unemployment is intense. Though we have no real employment statistics, we may safely assume, from the reports of the co-operatives, the sick benefit societies, and the state employment bureaus, that at least 15 to 20 per cent of the workers of Hungary to-day are unemployed.

“Building during the past year has been practically at a standstill. Not only do the banks refuse credit, but, owing to their financial stress, municipalities and the state as well as the railroads, have reduced their investments to a minimum. Military preparations have swallowed up the money of the nation. The misery of the working-class is beyond belief.

“There is only one escape: emigration. But the Government uses every possible means to prevent this. No man of military age has been allowed to cross the border since the beginning of the Balkan troubles. Bitter need, however, has made our people clever. They use the most impossible ruses to pass the countless *armes de garde* that make the border well-nigh impassable. The emigrants

go disguised as pilgrims wandering to some holy place. They climb high mountains or cross the water in light rowboats. Some have escaped across the border line by buying a load of pigs with which they travel as caretakers until they reach Vienna, where they sell the pigs and go on their way. Others arrange appointments with prominent physicians of Vienna. A book could be written describing the numberless tricks resorted to by these unfortunate Hungarians, that they might shake the dust of their fatherland from their feet forever. Conditions are so terrible that a borough president reported the other day to the Minister of the Interior that in his district there are 10,000 unemployed who, together with 40,000 members of their families, are facing starvation. . . .

“Between the undeveloped industrial life and the overdeveloped militaristic aspirations of our monarchy, there is a bottomless chasm. Year after year our military department clamors for more soldiers, more money. But in its undeveloped condition, the country cannot support its own population. When the soldiers are mustered, frequently more than 50 per cent of the recruits fail to appear. No border police, no whining will bring them. Nor will the new practice of examining emigrants on the Austrian border as severely as has been the case in Hungary itself alter the situation. The people have no bread and they will go where it can be found.

“It is only natural that this hopeless industrial situation should react unfavorably on the labor movement, both in its industrial and its political organization. This is probably the explanation for the passive endurance by the Hungarian working-class, yes, by the whole Hungarian population, of the absolutism of the Tisza clique.

“The political situation of Hungary remains practically unchanged since our last report. Since the dropping of

the general strike and the passage of Tisza's election reform, a certain lethargy has overcome all of our fighting spirits. The working-class has not been able to muster its forces for serious action. In the ranks of the opposition . . . conservatism is gaining the upper hand. The whole opposition has been boycotting Parliament. Party lines have been changed through the founding of a new party under the leadership of the great landowner, Count Andrassy, a notorious enemy of union labor in his former capacity as Minister. This new conservative-opposition party claims that it is able to sustain the unity with Austria and has embodied this with the development of militarism in its program. Concerning election reform, the new party, while demanding more liberal provisions than those passed under Tisza, refuses to support the demands upon which our party and the opposition have united. . . .

"Though the leaders were profuse in their assurances that they would adhere to their election promises, they looked calmly on while the Government robbed the people of its last vestige of power. The right of public assemblage was curtailed by a bill making speakers and officers in a public meeting personally responsible for the maintenance of order. The jurisdiction of the jury courts was limited and political newspaper cases were assigned to judges instead of jury courts. Press laws were increased in severity. A new law, that permits the arrest of unemployed who are unwilling to work as vagrants, and their confinement in the workhouse, makes it possible to wage war upon striking workers. . . .

"It was to be expected that these occurrences should find expression at the Convention. Some of the speakers insisted that our fusion with the opposition was doing us more harm than good, that it was obliterating the class-line for the workers to see their leaders make common cause

with such notorious reactionaries as are some of the members of the opposition. Others insisted that these common meetings give our speakers a chance to address people whom we can otherwise never hope to reach. . . . Some were sure that the opposition would betray the cause of election reform as soon as an opportunity presented itself. After a thorough discussion a resolution was adopted indorsing the party tactics of the past and assuring all opposition groups of our support, provided they not only declare their satisfaction with Tisza's election reform, but demand an election reform, at least as far-reaching as the measures decided upon by our party in conjunction with the parties of the opposition last year. This excluded the Andrassy party. At the same time the resolution reaffirms the necessity of carrying on an intensive campaign for the fundamental suffrage demands of our party, the right of general, secret, and equal suffrage for both sexes. . . .

"It is easily possible that the election reform of Tisza may never take effect. It cannot become effective before a year after a reapportionment of election districts has passed Parliament. But this bill has not even been drafted, and the term of this Reichstag expires in the spring of 1915. If, therefore, this bill is not presented within the next few months, the coming election will be conducted under the old election laws, an eventuality that, we firmly believe, would be acceptable to all parties. In 1915 or 1916 a readjustment of the Austro-Hungarian agreement will be reached, presenting a splendid opportunity for postponing election reforms for another five years.

"This was the first time since the founding of the Hungarian Socialist Party that a speech concerning our foreign policy was delivered before a party convention. A resolution was adopted protesting against the aggressive policy of our monarchy, demanding that our nation pro-

tect its national strength, not by constant armaments, but by the peaceful methods of internal social and industrial development.”

III. POLITICAL JUGGLERY IN HUNGARY, 1914

(In *Justice*, London)

“The electoral law of Hungary has been very little improved by the reforms introduced by the present government. On three different occasions within the last eight years has manhood suffrage been promised in speeches from the throne, but the ruling caste in Hungary has managed to balk the intentions of the sovereign. It must not be supposed that the latter had suddenly become a democrat. Far from it. The pronouncement in favor of manhood suffrage was made to break the resistance of the Hungarian governing class, the landowners of Magyar nationality, for an increase in the army, and to hold up by that means also the movement of the same class for still greater independence.

“It was calculated in court circles that, with a wider suffrage, the other nationalities in Hungary would obtain enlarged representation (at present the Magyars, with 55 per cent of the population, hold 393 seats, the other nationalities, altogether about eight millions, have 20 seats); further, that the lower middle class and the workmen would form new parties, and that with a parliament thus split up the Crown would have less difficulty than with a parliament dominated by one class and one race. The Magyar nobles, however, are skilled politicians. They saw through the game; the increases of the army were voted; and the electoral reform was carried out in such manner that in all essentials the rule of the Magyar aristocracy is not seriously threatened. At first our party, when it

became clear that nothing approaching manhood suffrage could be expected, decided on boycotting the elections and to carry on the agitation for a thoroughgoing reform. Gradually, however, it was recognized that it might be worth while to try whether, even under this new law, a breach might not be made and some Socialists returned to this, the last parliament of Europe without any Socialist members.

“Under the new law the vote by ballot is secured for 63 electoral divisions in cities and boroughs. The franchise is granted to the town workmen who are 30 years of age, can read and write, and fulfill a few other conditions. What this means may be seen from the fact that in Budapest there are close on 100,000 workers over 24 years of age, but the number of voters of all classes will not exceed some 40,000. The greatest factor in proletarian politics, the numerical preponderance of the labor vote, is therefore absent.

The first stage in the electoral struggle, once participation in it had been decided upon, was to get the working-class voters registered. To keep them off the register as much as possible the local authorities ordered the educational tests to take place nearly everywhere on week days during working hours, reckoning that many workmen would not care to lose a day's work for the sake of a vote. In some districts the regulations also prescribed a personal individual application to be made by the citizen who wished to be put upon the register, which in most cases would have meant another day lost.

“Our party set to work and succeeded in getting these regulations altered, so that the qualifying educational tests now take place in the evenings, and notices for admission to the voters' lists can be given by third persons. In all districts where our party has sufficient adherents to under-

take a contest electoral associations have been formed, and the work of propaganda and collection of names has been carried out. For the 22 Budapest constituencies 5,000 comrades volunteered for this canvassing work, which was done in the second week of May. The total number of names handed in by the party organizers was more than 30,000, the number of individual applications for the whole of Budapest only about 1,000. Probably a certain number of applications will still be rejected, as elementary education is sadly neglected in Hungary; and, in the hands of unscrupulous persons, as most of the officials of administrative authorities are, the educational tests may easily be used to deprive workmen of the vote.

“However, the preliminary work of collecting names, of explaining the provisions of the electoral law, holding meetings, and selling literature, etc., has put new life into the party, which was greatly discouraged by the non-success of the movement for manhood suffrage, and saw its funds depleted by the terrible economic crisis through which the working-class has passed since the commencement of the Balkan wars. The party will therefore be on the alert to prevent violation of the law by the officials, and to see to it that the Socialist Party at the election gets its full chance of bringing its voters to the poll. The Central Committee for Budapest, which conducts all the administrative work of preparation and organization, and which is appointed by the municipality, has two Socialists amongst its members, comrades Buchinger and Weltner, who will keep their eyes open for any tricks that officialdom might like to play. It is not known yet when the election will take place, but at the latest it must be in May next; probably, however, it will be in the autumn that the Hungarian working-class will get its first chance of voting.

“There is no possibility of doing anything in the country districts, where open voting is still the law. It is here that the mass of the proletariat of the Magyar race toils for the lords, where the worst conditions obtain, and the most rigorous terrorism and oppression will be applied to secure electoral success for the governing class. The number of Magyar agricultural workers is estimated at 630,000, the non-Magyar, mostly Roumanian and Slavonic, at 49,000. The town workers are computed at 250,000 Magyars and 160,000 non-Magyars (German, Slavonic, Roumanian, etc.). Among the farmers and peasant freeholders the Magyars are in a decided minority, so much so that in numbers the Magyars are only three-eighths of the land-owning classes all told, whilst, as to the extent of property held, the proportion is the reverse, if not more so, the vast estates being the property of Magyar nobles almost exclusively.”

CHAPTER X

SPAIN AND PORTUGAL

SPAIN

I. INTRODUCTORY

A SPANISH Socialist Party was founded in 1879, but held its first congress in 1888 at Barcelona. By 1913 the party had 12,000 members, divided into 198 groups. Its daily organ, *El Socialista*, was founded at Madrid that year.

In 1891 it received 5,000 votes at the national election; in 1896, 14,000; in 1898, 23,000; in 1904, 26,000, and in 1907, 23,000.

At the election of 1910 there was a considerable increase, the party receiving approximately 41,000 votes. This increase continued in the elections of 1912, when Pablo Iglesias received over 40,000 votes and was elected to the Cortes from Madrid—being the only Socialist member of that body. In 1910, however, a close electoral alliance had been formed between the Socialists and Republicans, who are 16 in number in the Cortes.

II. THE SITUATION IN SPAIN

By Pablo Iglesias, Madrid

(From *Vorwaerts*, May 15, 1914)

“Spain is in a serious, critical situation. The Conservative Party, now in power, is divided by schisms, which threaten the life of the party and the monarchy.

“Maura, the former leader of this party, has withdrawn from political life. Between him and his aid, the present prime minister, Dato, and all his followers, exists serious dissension. This withdrawal from political life is not taken seriously, for Maura’s son, Gabriel, as well as some other followers of Maura’s, are busily engaged in exciting public opinion against the government. The object of this attack is to arouse friendly feelings towards the man against whom hate and disgust arose in all civilized countries when he had Ferrer shot.

“The agitation of these followers of Maura’s is turned not only against Dato’s government, but also against the king. In spite of their assurance of monarchical loyalty, these monarchists neglect no opportunity to attack Alfonso XIII. Gabriel Maura declared at a recent meeting that his father had not been in favor of the Morocco war. Although several skirmishes between Spanish troops and Arabs had taken place in 1909, he declared these could have been suppressed through police measures, as they were only disturbances of the peace. Maura approved of these police measures, and these only. Maura’s son intended by this statement to place the blame of the unhappy war on the king.

“Maura is finding that the secret hatred which his followers have against the king is reacting against himself. The king is endeavoring to crystallize public opinion against him for the purpose ultimately of pushing him out of public life. In order to attain this end, he has reached an understanding between the leaders of the largest Liberal groups and Dato. It is possible that the king might be able to defeat Maura once for all, but not without danger to the monarchical régime.

“Like the Conservative Party, the Spanish Liberals are divided among themselves. Their majority collects

around Count Romanones, the predecessor of Dato. The smaller group of the Liberals has Garcia Prieto as leader. It was he who signed the treaty between Spain and France when he was state minister in the cabinet of Romanones. This group, which works against the present government and secretly against the Liberal Party, calls itself now the Democratic Party. These are the parties which give their support to Alfonso's monarchy.

"There are other monarchical elements, but they are of less importance. One, for instance, is the Regionalists, or Spanish Separatists, a group of politicians from Catalonia, anxious to secure autonomy for that province. It is their custom to associate with Conservatives, Carlists, and other minor groups.

"Opposing these monarchical political powers are the Republican and the Socialist parties. The Republicans command large masses of people, while the Socialist Party counts among its members all class-conscious workers. The party is excellently organized. The Republicans and the Socialists form a coalition, founded in 1909, with the idea of overthrowing Maura. Personal ambition induced some of the Republican leaders to withdraw from the party and to become adherents of the monarchy, provided this monarchy took up more liberal and democratic policies. It is needless to say that these political deserters, at the head of which were Melquiades Alvarez and Azcarate, were sharply criticised by all advanced political elements.

"The principal reason for Spain's sad condition lies in 'our international politics.' The Spanish rulers, who are stupid and servile, have entered into treaties for the country which only serve the selfish interests of French and English citizens, and which flatter the imperial longings of the king and the militarists who for selfish reasons pretend to be devoted to the monarch.

“The war in Morocco is a result of the policies pursued by this government. This war has lasted five years already, and has not only cost the country human lives, but also many millions of pesetas, and has brought nothing in return but the loss of Spain’s reputation. At present the army which is stationed in Morocco costs the country one million pesetas (\$200,000) a day.

“Another result of the activities of this government is the erection of a new fleet, which has so far cost \$40,000,000—this sum might as well have been thrown in the water—and the preparations for new and expensive coast defenses.

“The building of an electric railway from Madrid to the French frontier is still another outcome of this policy. This will also cost several million pesetas, its purpose being to transport troops from France to Africa, or from Africa to France, when the international situation demands such action.

“These immense expenses gradually exhaust the country, especially as Spain has such a very small taxing power. The debts grow greater and greater, and with them the taxes, while, as a result, the cost of living increases. Emigration, on account of the misery and the war, is exceedingly great. The war in Morocco finds no supporters in the entire country. The supporters of the war themselves, the king, several dealers, and the military group who prosper by it, do not dare to defend this adventure. The entire country is against the war, and the Republican, and especially the Socialist Party, are continually protesting against it in their press and at their meetings. It is possible that the immense cost of the war, the stupidity of the militarists, and the attitude of the king—it is said that he carries on the war behind the back of the government—may lead to an uprising. . . .

“As in former elections, the delegates who belong to the

Spanish *Cortes*, owe their seats to the misuse of the general suffrage by the government, or through the plutocratic elements, so that the present Parliament resembles the former almost wholly. Practically all the politicians who are to blame for the misery of Spain were again elected. Among the 408 delegates are 228 Conservatives, 120 Liberals and Democrats, and 16 of the Republican and Socialist coalition (among these only 1 Socialist). The remainder is made up of a number of smaller groups.

"It is almost certain that the government will not find a Conservative majority. To continue to live it will have to solicit the help of the Liberals, under the leadership of Romanones. Everyone believes that the life of this parliament will be very short and very unfruitful. The present government or its successor, which will be of the same political complexion, will try to rule without Parliament, as has been the custom in Spain.

"During its short life this Parliament will have a very stormy career. The immense folly of the war in Morocco will be laid bare before this assembly and King Alfonso will be branded as the principal culprit. Perhaps this criticism will press the people to free themselves from those who plunge the country into ruin."

PORTUGAL

I. INTRODUCTORY

At the Fifth Congress of the Portuguese Socialist Party (July, 1913) 50 local organizations were represented. The chief demands discussed were compulsory voting, proportional representation, the referendum, and woman suffrage.

In the November elections, the Socialists failed to increase their delegation in Parliament, which consists of

one member, Manuel José da Silva, of Oporto. In December, however, they elected 11 members to the municipal council of Oporto, gained a majority in Covilha, and elected members for the first time in several other towns.

II. THE GENERAL POLITICAL SITUATION

(A. F. G., in *The New Statesman*, January 3, 1914)

“The party now in power is that of the Democrats, under the leadership of the Premier, Senhor Affonso Costa. The organs of this party are *A Patria* and *O Mundo*, and, non-officially, *O Seculo*. There is the Unionist Party, under the leadership of Senhor Brito Camacho, with its organ, *A Lucta*, which has during the past year lent its support to Senhor Costa, and furnished him with a working majority in the Chamber. Violently opposed to Senhor Costa and the Democratic Party are the Evolutionists under Senhor Antonio José de Almeida, with their organ, *A Republica*. This party represents the real constitutional opposition within the republic. Its program is much more moderate than that of the Democrats, and its leader is a man of ability; but it has not hitherto shown that it possesses strength to assert itself or even to play a prominent part in practical politics. Besides these three Republican parties there is the group of Independents, also intensely Republican, but opposed to the republic as at present constituted. The leader of this fourth party is Senhor Machado Santos, its organ *O Intransigente*. The Royalists no more than the Republicans offer a united front. There are the supporters of King Manoel, the supporters of Dom Migoel (whose organ, *A Nação*, was temporarily suspended owing to the wrecking of its offices by the Carbonarios), and a third party of Royalists, who may be called *Sebastianistas*. These last are filled with a vague discontent and

look unfailingly to the return of former conditions, but know not exactly what they want or what prince they would have to reign over them. These indefinite and idealistic Royalists in Portugal occupy much the same position as the Carlists in Spain.

"A fourth Royalist Party is composed of unpatriotic persons, who desire foreign intervention and persuade themselves that order will be thoroughly restored only under a foreign prince, with foreign troops at his back.

"Then there is the Socialist Party, with its organ, *O Socialista*, which has gained somewhat in strength recently, and has attacked the republic as it perhaps never attacked the monarchy, complaining that the lot of the workmen has grown worse, that the governments of the republic have been as selfish and incompetent as those of the monarchy, and that the main difference has been that, whereas under the monarchy there was a vigorous opposition press, no such press has been allowed to exist under the republic. The Syndicalists, with their journal, *O Sindicalista*, also have many adepts among the workmen and in the navy. There exist, too, many anarchist manufacturers of bombs, and many Radical Republicans, who have already made several attempts to effect a *coup d'état* and replace the present Ministry by a Ministry of a more frankly popular and Socialistic character, and to inaugurate the *Republica Radical*, of which the conspirators wore the yellow badge.

"And through all these groups and parties runs the sinister vein of the *Carbonaria*, the white Carbonarios, the black Carbonarios, the 'Sons of Night' (*Filhos da Noite*), the devotees of Senhor Costa. It would require a Talleyrand to thread these mazes. Yet it is a country of but six million inhabitants, and the census taken at the end of 1911 records the number of those who can neither write

nor read as 75 per cent of the entire population. These illiterates have not the vote and are for the most part indifferent to politics; so that we have this dozen or more of contending parties in a million and a half inhabitants. . . . The Democrat Party cannot be acquitted of the chief responsibility for the widespread discontent and for the isolation in which the republic now subsists. Far from seeking to win over opponents, it has heaped insults and insinuations even on fellow Republicans whom it has suspected of a tendency to moderation, and has encouraged the Carbonarios to spy out and persecute. And its leader, Senhor Costa, is, like Janus, double-faced. On the one hand he represents himself (especially in his intercourse with the foreign ministers) as a man of sense and moderation, on the other hand he freely indorses the outrages committed by the Carbonarios. He is thus more likely to succeed for a while than to bring any true or permanent improvement to the state of Portugal. Like the performance of a rope-dancer, his administration is unlikely to be prolonged and may end in disaster, however skillfully he maintains his balance for the moment. 'He knows that Portugal is threatened by only one danger—bankruptcy,' said his intimate friend, the editor of the *Mundo*, last March; and to the abolition of the deficit Senhor Costa has devoted much of his energy. But since the effect of his policy has been to drive capital from the country, the distress in Portugal has become worse than it was before the revolution, the exchanges have gone down and emigration has gone up. It may be argued that this is but natural after a revolution. But the revolution of October, 1910, was not in itself a great upheaval, and it was followed by an attitude of expectation and, in parts of the country, of welcome. The ignorant, who had been led to look for the Millennium, were, of course, doomed from the first to disappointment;

but level-headed observers have been not less deeply disappointed in the results of the revolution. *O Socialista* wrote as follows last July:

“A violent change of government may be welcomed by honest Republicans and sincere patriots who desire a modern, tolerant, and progressive republic, and an era of tranquillity, work, and study for their country. . . . Like João Franco and all tyrannical despotic governments, Senhor Costa's government has produced an effect profoundly revolutionary. By his attitude in power he has made more anarchists and syndicalists than have been secured by all the work of propaganda.

“And in many camps, openly or underground, men are working and plotting to undermine the present administration.”

CHAPTER XI

ROUMANIA, BULGARIA, AND GREECE

ROUMANIA

I. INTRODUCTORY

THE Social Democratic Party of Roumania was organized at Bukharest, February 2, 1910. For several years prior to that date, the movement had no political character, consisting mainly of scattered "circles," whose chief activity was the organization of trade-unions and the holding of occasional lectures and mass meetings on timely topics.

Since 1899, which year marked the disappearance of the first Socialist or pseudo-Socialist movement in Roumania, by the wholesale abandonment of its intellectual leaders, all of whom joined the so-called Liberal Party, and—as in France—assumed leading positions within it, Roumania has been without any definite Socialistic organization. In 1905 Dr. C. Racovsky, who, with C. Dobrogeanu-Gherea, Roumania's foremost economist and literary critic, were the only remaining loyal Socialists, began to tour the country, getting in touch with stray comrades in various localities. At the same time, Racovsky and a few comrades at Bukharest commenced issuing a weekly, the *Romania Municitoare* (Laboring Roumania). This activity resulted in the formation of the circles above mentioned. These had no organic connection, nor, for that matter, any definite program of activity until 1910, when, following the passage of a law prohibiting government employees from joining

labor-unions, the movement considered the possibility of saving itself by the formation of a political party.

The first national Executive Committee—and members of this committee are even at the present time the most active members of the movement—were: C. Racovsky, D. Marinresco, M. Gh. Bujor, N. C. Georgesco, I. C. Frimou, Al. Constantinesco, and C. Vasilescu.

As the party is now constituted, it consists of a central organization at Bukharest, with branches, called “clubs,” in the principal cities. Besides conducting the political part of the activity, these clubs also assist in the organization of trade-unions. The two phases of the movement are very closely allied. The trade-union membership is at present about ten thousand, and includes only private employees. The official organ, *Romania Muncitoare*, now appears three times a week. One-half of each issue is devoted to the Socialist movement and the other half to the trade-unions. The movement also conducts a publishing enterprise, issuing original or translated pamphlets and books from time to time. There is also a monthly scientific and literary magazine, *Viitorul Social* (The Social Future) of about the size of the *Neue Zeit*. Then there are various trade papers, one of the waiters, metal-workers, railroad men, and one or two of the other trades.

The movement has passed through important crises since its organization. The first was in 1907, following the Peasant Rebellion, when the party was almost completely annihilated. All clubs were closed, books and cash confiscated, and the members mobilized, and almost a thousand native Jewish party members expelled from the country. The Government, in its fury, instituted proceedings against Dr. Racovsky, and by means of documents subsequently proved to be false, denied the latter his citizenship, and in his absence as delegate to the International

Congress at Stuttgart, declared him expelled from Roumania. Racovsky made several attempts to re-enter the country, each time at a different point, in order to have himself brought before a court where he could prove his citizenship. But in each case he was arrested and clandestinely returned across the frontier. It was only in 1912, after a change of cabinet, and after innumerable efforts of friends, that he was finally permitted to present his claims before the court. He did so, and his citizenship was restored to him.

The second crisis was in the nature of an internal strife in 1913, at the time of the Balkan War. As is well known, Roumania did not participate actively in this struggle. The great victories of Bulgaria, however, aroused the Roumanian Government's jealousy, and it began to wage a campaign of hostility against that neighboring country. When the war fever was at its highest, a Roumanian army was dispatched across the Danube and occupied a small province (Silvestria) which the Bulgarians were unable to defend. Some of the intellectuals of the party, notably two lawyers, N. D. Cocea and Th. Dragu, were caught in the whirl of patriotism and defended the war in spite of a contrary action of the party. This led to such marked dissatisfaction within the ranks that these two were forced to resign. On this occasion the party got rid of a few obstreperous opportunists, and now presents a strictly Socialist front. The last convention in 1914 ratified the stand of the central party organization at the time of the war.

Although numerically and politically weak, the party put up candidates in a number of campaigns in several localities. The vote is necessarily small, but contributes to the political education of the masses. At Galatz and Tulcea, however, the vote exceeded all anticipations.

II. PROGRAM OF THE SOCIALIST PARTY, ADOPTED AT THE ABOVE CONVENTION IN 1910

1. POLITICAL PROGRAM

a. Equal direct and secret universal suffrage for all inhabitants above 20 years, irrespective of nationality, creed, or sex, not subjects of any other country; as well as for aliens residing in the country 10 years or more, renouncing all foreign allegiance. Proportional representation; holding of elections on a legal holiday; compensation for the elected officers; abolition of the Senate.

b. This can all be summed up in the initiative, referendum, and recall; extensive administrative decentralization and local home rule.

c. Abolition of the expulsion law, and sundry other exception laws. (This law nominally applicable to foreigners has been extensively used against Socialists, *native* Jewish members of the party, having been expelled by the hundreds, especially during the peasant outbreak in 1907.) Equalization of the rights of the inhabitants of Dobrudja. (This province was acquired from Turkey following the Independence War of 1877. Ever since the province has been subject to exception laws, inhabitants being deprived of the suffrage or parliamentary representation.) Complete equalization of the civic and political rights of native Jews with those of other citizens. (Although the native Jews are subject to civic and military duty, pay taxes, etc., they are enjoying no political freedom whatever, always being implicitly included in any act applicable to "foreigners.")

d. Restitution of political and civic privileges to all city, district, and state employees.

e. Equalization, political and legal, of the sexes, and the fostering of paternal responsibility upon the father for his illegitimate children.

f. Punishment by law of public employees who interfere with the exercise of the political rights of the citizens.

g. Establishment of honest, equitable, and independent justice. Gratuity of legal processes, damages for illegally arrested or prosecuted citizens, right of appeal, election of judges and jurors by popular vote.

h. The establishment of the right of appeal against all admin-

istrative and judicial decisions for the benefit of all public employees.

i. Free and compulsory education for children of all creeds and nationalities, with due regard for the languages of the various ethnical groups. Secularization of education. Equalization of the village school with the town school. Establishment of vocational and agricultural schools. Compulsory education to 14 years. Generalization of school lunchrooms. Free clothing, food, books, and school supplies for needy children in primary, secondary, and vocational schools. Assistance to needy and deserving pupils for the continuation of their studies.

j. Direct proportional and progressive income and inheritance tax. Gradual abrogation of all indirect taxes, incomes of 3,000 francs or less to be exempt from all taxation.

k. Separation of church from the state, leaving church administration to the care of its members.

l. All city, district, and state employees to be under civil service.

m. Considering the army only as a means of protecting the country, and in no way as an instrument of repression against the working-class and its struggles for freedom, we demand the transformation of the standing army into a national militia; until such change is effected, we demand the reduction of the military service to one year. Abrogation of court-martials; compulsory education in barracks and camps.

2. AGRARIAN PROGRAM

a. Abrogation of all feudal remnants in the relation of agrarian production.

b. Abrogation of feudal contracts, as tithes, and other hidden forms of servitude. All agreements and payments to be made in specie.

c. Compulsory expropriation as far as possible of great portions of extensive land holdings.

d. All such expropriated lands to form a national fund under state supervision. Individuals or peasant associations to rent from this fund parcels of land for terms of not less than 50 years. Right of renewal of contract to be vested in the tenant's heirs (wife, children, etc.). Tenant to be allowed to subrent his

parcel to a third party, the only condition being that the latter work the parcel himself.

e. Amount of rent to be decided by a commission of peasants and landowners, so constituted as to safeguard the interests of the peasants. These prices to be universally prevailing and applicable to all owners.

f. The income of the fund to be divided in two, as follows: One part for the payment of interests and amortization of the capital expended in buying. Second part, less administrative expenses, to be distributed among all communities and to be used only for public welfare work, improvement of agricultural work, or increase in holdings.

g. Special legislation to facilitate the formation of peasants' associations, providing for city and state assistance in the form of procuring seeds, fertilizer, and modern machinery.

h. Organization of a rural bank to lend money to peasants on a nominal interest in proportion to the latter's holdings. This bank also to make provisions for the wholesale and common disposal of the agricultural products of its members, as well as for the purchase of seeds and machinery. This bank to be a state institution.

i. Expropriation of inalienable city or private pasture grounds at prices to be established as above provided for.

j. Total prevention of the sale of land or forests belonging to the state or cities to private individuals. The same to apply also to all other natural resources—waterfalls, rivers, mines, etc.

k. Encouragement by the state and cities of systematic agriculture and breeding, by means of traveling instructors, experiment stations, etc.

l. Practical agricultural instructions by means of special schools, or special courses in existing rural schools, in the latter case not at the expense of the regular course of study.

m. Improvement on rivers, creation of canals for irrigation, drainage of swamps, installation of artesian wells, etc. Construction of public highways and railways for local purposes. Artificial forestation.

n. Tenants of parcels of land to be entitled to compensation for any improvement which adds to the value of the land.

o. Abolition by law of the right of landowners to prosecute or attach the product of the soil. The establishment of a reserve

of instruments, products, fertilizers, head of cattle, indispensable to every household and forever inalienable.

p. Establishment of a minimum wage by the commission for journeymen and seasonal workers.

q. All laws protecting labor to apply to rural labor as well, with due regard to the particular circumstances.

r. To reduce to a minimum the transportation cost on railroads for agricultural workers, especially during the season. To facilitate the movement of such workers to places best suitable for them.

s. Abrogation of all land taxes for peasants working their fields by hand.

t. Reduction of transportation costs for fertilizers, machinery, and agricultural products.

u. Freedom of game and fishing, except such restrictions as are necessary for the protection of the game and for the prevention of damage to the crops.

BULGARIA

PLEA FOR UNITY AMONG BULGARIAN SOCIALISTS

(From *Vorwaerts*)

The International Socialist Bureau has addressed to the Socialists of Bulgaria the following communication:

For many years the International has looked upon the struggle among the Socialists of Bulgaria with a heavy heart. In spite of the resolution adopted by the Amsterdam Congress concerning united action on the part of all Socialists, a resolution which was first carried out by our French comrades and which will again bear fruit in the union of the British parties, the Bulgarian parties have yet to take the first step toward a mutual understanding. While you preach "Peace between all nations," you tear each other to pieces and present to the world a picture of senseless and unfounded enmity.

At the last elections, particularly, the worst passions entered into play. Grievances were painfully dragged out, mutual accusations and recriminations were the order of the day. And now, after the dissolution of Parliament, we observe a bitter struggle

between Socialists, where the combat should be fought, with united forces, against the capitalist class.

Comrades: Your country is practically devoid of any laws for the protection of the working-class. You live under a system of government that is hardly more than a caricature of freedom and democracy. A new outbreak of hostility threatens the Balkan nations, and you are neither strong enough, nor numerous enough, to face this militaristic combat.

Comrades of both parties: We have the right to speak in the name of the whole international movement, when we ask you to put an end to your differences, which serve only to decrease your own influence, to fill your enemies with joy. In all our parties there are various shades of theoretical opinion. We were not Socialists if we did not desire, as men who think for ourselves, to find the truth and to fix our tactics according to the change of conditions and times. We ask you, therefore, to listen to us and to pave the way for a union of the Bulgarian Socialist forces.

Even if this union be difficult at the present time, some understanding must be reached at the time of the election. Do not place opposing Socialist candidates into the field.

You are called upon to become an influential and perhaps a deciding factor in the coming struggle. You have no right to squander your forces uselessly to diminish your strength. The victory of democracy in the East means a wonderful strengthening of democracy in the West, signifies the coming triumph of modern ideas in the whole world.

For the International Socialist Bureau,
The Executive Board.

É. VANDERVELDE,

E. ANSEELE,

L. BERTRAND,

C. HUYSMANS, Secretary.

GREECE

Greece has experienced a rapid industrial development during the last 15 years. As far back as the year 1885, Dr. Dracoules began with his propaganda work. In 1893, as leader of the Greek Socialist Party, he secured 4,000

votes in Athens, and in 1901 he was elected to the Greek Parliament, where he served several years.

Attempts have often been made during the past few years to establish a consolidated economic or political organization, but up to the present without any satisfactory results. This regrettable state of affairs may be attributed to the fact that emigration is increasing day by day, and it is just the most skilled and intelligent workers who are driven from their homes on account of their unfortunate political and economic conditions. At any rate, the constant agitation of a more progressive body has already had a great influence upon public opinion, and it is to-day generally recognized that the present conditions are untenable.

It was in 1909 that the military arose and swept away the existing government. The movement was supported by a great mass of the people, because an improvement in their conditions was hoped for as soon as new members were elected to the government. The new government relied to a certain extent upon the Socialist or semi-Socialist elements which had arisen from the Dracoules propaganda, and had developed a program "of struggle against the plutocracy." Venizelos, the skillful prime minister, succeeded in turning a part of the movement to his purposes, at the same time that he was building up the Balkan League against Turkey inspired by the idea—launched by the Socialists—of a confederation of all the nations of the peninsula.

The government also succeeded in serving their own financial interests under the cloak of a propaganda campaign against modern capitalism. The people were forced to put up with this because they were helpless and disunited. The new political power offered brutal opposition to any attempt on the part of the workers to organize. Dr. Dracoules, in 1912, secured 12,000 of the 48,000 votes of

Athens, and was almost elected in another district where he was also candidate. Nevertheless, the propaganda and the rising number of votes for the new movement resulted in a small progressive group in Parliament pushing forward with the labor laws.

In the meantime a Socialist weekly paper was established for the purpose of furthering the propaganda and organization work systematically. This was the first necessity—having regard to the great disruption in the existing groups. There is a very mixed "Labor Federation of Athens and Piraeus," to which 17 industries belong, whilst 1 yellow organization has compromised 14 groups since 1910. Some 15 organizations, which are naturally still weak, both numerically and financially, belong to a third tendency. They represent no unity, it is true, but there are hopes of building up modern organizations with these as a basis. The followers of Dracoules created a labor league in 1909, which comprised two separate organizations—one Socialist Party and one trades-union center. This league has organizations in several towns. It propagates an understanding between the workers of the other Balkan States, hoping to put an end to the race hatred which exists.

SECTION III

THE SOCIALIST MOVEMENT IN AMERICA

CHAPTER XII

THE NUMERICAL STATUS OF SOCIALISM IN THE UNITED STATES

THE following statistics will make clear the status of the Socialist Party in 1914.

It will be noticed that the high-water mark of membership was reached in the presidential year, 1912; that the figures went down in 1913, rose past the 100,000 mark in the first five months of 1914, but fell so far in the latter half of that year (the breaking out of the European war) as to bring the membership for the whole year even below that of 1913. This fall has continued during 1915.

1. MEMBERSHIP BY YEARS

The Socialist Party was organized early in August, 1901. The records are too incomplete to determine just how many members we had in the years 1901 and 1902. The membership for each year since then was as follows:

1903	15,975	1910	58,011
1904	20,763	1911	84,716
1905	23,327	1912	117,984
1906	26,784	1913	95,401
1907	29,270	1914 (first 5 months)	..	106,097
1908	41,751	1914 (entire year)	93,579
1909	41,479	1915	85,000

2. MEMBERSHIP IN SEPARATE STATES

Table for 1912. Order of Rank

Rank	Name of state	Average membership for 1912	Total population	Population to each member
1.	Nevada	687	81,875	119
2.	Alaska	407	64,356	158
3.	Washington	6,326	1,141,990	180
4.	Idaho	1,673	325,594	195
5.	Wyoming	696	145,965	210
6.	Montana	1,611	376,053	233
7.	Arizona	689	204,354	298
8.	Oregon	2,205	672,765	305
9.	Oklahoma	4,775	1,657,155	344
10.	North Dakota	1,662	577,056	347
11.	Minnesota	5,514	2,075,708	376
12.	California	5,962	2,377,549	399
13.	Colorado	1,864	799,024	429
14.	Wisconsin	4,635	2,333,860	504
15.	Utah	729	373,351	512
16.	Pennsylvania	12,689	7,665,111	604
17.	Kansas	2,603	1,690,949	649
18.	Ohio	7,090	4,767,121	672
19.	New Jersey	3,486	2,537,167	728
20.	Massachusetts	4,519	3,336,416	738
21.	Connecticut	1,505	1,114,756	741
22.	Indiana	3,469	2,700,876	779
23.	New Hampshire	545	430,572	790
24.	Illinois	6,727	5,638,591	838
25.	Texas	4,583	3,896,542	850
26.	Florida	861	751,139	872
27.	Michigan	3,176	2,810,173	884
28.	New York	9,801	9,113,279	930
29.	West Virginia	1,175	122,119	1,039
30.	Vermont	303	355,956	1,175
31.	Missouri	2,749	3,293,335	1,198
32.	New Mexico	273	327,396	1,199
33.	District of Columbia...	267	331,069	1,213

Rank	Name of state	Average membership for 1912	Total population	Population to each member
34.	Iowa	1,806	2,224,771	1,232
35.	Rhode Island	439	542,674	1,236
36.	Nebraska	806	1,068,484	1,325
37.	Arkansas	1,103	1,574,449	1,427
38.	Delaware	136	202,322	1,488
39.	South Dakota	375	583,888	1,557
40.	Maine	460	742,371	1,614
41.	Maryland	635	1,294,450	2,038
42.	Louisiana	550	1,656,388	3,011
43.	Kentucky	500	2,289,905	4,580
44.	Alabama	377	2,138,093	5,665
45.	Tennessee	368	2,184,789	5,937
46.	Virginia	229	2,061,612	9,003
47.	North Carolina	200	2,206,287	11,031
48.	Mississippi	148	1,797,114	12,142
49.	South Carolina	102	1,515,400	14,661
50.	Georgia	150	2,609,121	17,394

Table for 1914. Alphabetical Order

Alabama	217	Kentucky	270
Alaska	546	Louisiana	462
Arizona	460	Maine	407
Arkansas	533	Maryland	481
California	5,252	Massachusetts	4,830
Colorado	1,237	Michigan	2,943
Connecticut	1,368	Minnesota	4,965
Delaware	35	Mississippi	124
District of Columbia....	251	Missouri	1,806
Florida	696	Montana	1,589
Georgia	39	Nebraska	559
Idaho	905	Nevada	614
Illinois	6,562	New Hampshire	596
Indiana	2,222	New Jersey	3,364
Iowa	1,070	New Mexico	191
Kansas	1,959	New York	10,717

194 THE SOCIALIST PARTIES OF THE WORLD

North Carolina	75	Vermont	206
North Dakota	1,644	Virginia	224
Ohio	4,626	Washington	3,241
Oklahoma	7,039	West Virginia	850
Oregon	1,306	Wisconsin	3,885
Pennsylvania	7,648	Wyoming	648
Rhode Island	545	UNORGANIZED	
South Carolina	81	Members-at-large	32
South Dakota	427	Hawaii	33
Tennessee	221	French Federation	193
Texas	2,893		
Utah	448	Total	93,579

3. VOTE IN PROPORTION TO POPULATION OF STATES

(From *Party Builder*, No. 17)

State	* Socialist vote, 1912	Total vote, 1912	Voters to each Socialist voter. No. Non-Socialist
Nevada	3,313	20,115	5
Oklahoma	42,262	254,389	5
Arizona	3,163	23,722	6
Montana	10,885	79,826	6
Washington	* 42,026	322,819	7
California	79,201	672,527	8
Idaho	11,960	105,755	8
Oregon	13,343	137,040	9
Florida	4,806	51,891	10
Minnesota	* 29,717	334,219	10
Ohio	* 92,553	1,033,558	10
Texas	* 25,326	302,768	11
Utah	* 9,532	112,385	11
Wisconsin	* 34,003	399,972	11
North Dakota	6,966	86,580	11
Illinois	* 85,344	1,146,173	12
Kansas	26,779	365,497	13
Pennsylvania	* 84,318	1,220,201	13
Arkansas	8,153	124,029	14

State	* Socialist vote, 1912	Total vote, 1912	Voters to each Socialist voter. No. Non-Socialists
Colorado	* 16,893	266,880	14
Louisiana	5,249	79,441	14
Wyoming	2,760	42,296	15
Indiana	* 40,061	654,474	15
Connecticut	* 11,316	190,398	15
New Mexico	2,859	49,412	16
West Virginia	15,336	268,560	17
Michigan	* 24,463	550,976	22
New York	* 67,632	1,587,983	22
Missouri	* 30,244	698,562	22
Nebraska	10,219	249,515	23
New Jersey	* 17,250	432,650	24
South Dakota	4,662	116,365	24
Iowa	16,967	492,356	28
Mississippi	2,061	64,528	30
Rhode Island	* 2,285	77,894	33
Massachusetts	* 13,932	489,548	34
Kentucky	* 12,603	453,698	35
Alabama	3,029	117,879	38
New Hampshire	1,980	87,960	43
Maine	2,541	129,640	50
Maryland	* 4,318	231,981	53
Vermont	928	62,841	67
Tennessee	3,492	247,821	70
Delaware	556	48,693	87
Georgia	1,028	121,414	117
Virginia	* 870	136,976	156
North Carolina	1,025	243,918	237
South Carolina	164	50,350	306
Total for United States. *930,601		15,039,475	16

* Since it was cast for Socialism against capitalism, we have included the Socialist Labor Party vote of 29,240 in this table, distributed among the states marked with an asterisk where it was polled.

The foregoing tables reveal some interesting facts regarding the geographical distribution of Socialism. The manufacturing states, New York, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Illinois, etc., are well toward the lower half of both lists, while the leading states in proportional Socialist vote and membership are those devoted to the extractive industries, mining and farming.

4. VOTE COMPARED WITH THAT OF OTHER PARTIES IN 1908 AND 1912

1908	
Bryan (Dem.)	6,409,104
Taft (Rep.)	7,678,908
Chafin (Pro.)	253,840
Gilhaus (Soc. Labor)	13,825
Debs (Soc.)	424,488

1912		
Wilson (Dem.).....	6,291,878	Loss 117,226
Taft and Roosevelt (Rep.)...	7,608,234	Loss 69,674
Chafin (Pro.)	208,762	Loss 45,078
Reimer (Soc. Labor)	29,240	Gain 15,415
Debs (Soc.)	901,361	Gain 476,873

"The figures given are according to the latest official information. The slight revisions that may yet be made will not affect the showing.

"The table disproves the popular impression that there was a Democratic landslide. As a matter of fact, Wilson in 1912 received 117,226 less votes than Bryan in 1908. In spite of their victory the Democrats have, therefore, lost. Taft this year received only 3,484,806 votes. Adding to this the 4,123,428 votes that Roosevelt received, the combined Republican-Progressive vote still falls 69,674 short of the Republican vote of 1908. The Prohibitionists are also on the toboggan slide.

"On the other hand, both the Socialist Party and the Socialist Labor Party more than doubled their 1908 vote."

5. THE SOCIALIST VOTE OF 1914

The following table of the 1914 vote is incomplete, as the returns from some of the states had not yet come in by the end of the year. A decided falling off is noticeable, however, not only from the presidential year 1912, but even from the corresponding year 1910. The vote given is for governor, unless otherwise specified.

	1914	1910
Alabama (3)	1,159	1,633
Arizona	2,973
Arkansas	10,434	9,196
California	50,716	47,819
Colorado (1) (3).....	13,943	9,603
Connecticut (1)	5,914	12,179
Delaware (2)	463	556
Florida (5)	4,806	10,204
Georgia (4)	224	224
Idaho (1)	7,967	5,791
Illinois (3)	39,889	49,896
Indiana (1) (3).....	21,719	19,632
Iowa (1) (3).....	8,462	9,685
Kansas	20,360	16,994
Kentucky (1) (3).....	4,890	5,239
Louisiana (4)	706	706
Maine	1,872	1,641
Maryland (3)	3,255	3,924
Massachusetts	9,520	14,444
Michigan	11,056	10,608
Minnesota	17,225	18,363
Mississippi (4)	23	23
Missouri (3)	16,853	19,957
Montana (2)	9,430	5,412
Nebraska	5,754	6,721
Nevada (1) (3).....	5,426	3,637
New Hampshire (1).....	1,423	1,072
New Jersey (1) (2).....	14,581 *	10,134
New Mexico (2).....	1,101	1,787

* Vote for 1913.

	1914	1910
New York	37,793	48,982
North Carolina (3).....	425	437
North Dakota	6,019	5,114
Ohio (1)	48,596	62,356
Oklahoma (1)	52,570	24,707
Oregon	14,284	19,475
Pennsylvania	40,115	59,690
Rhode Island	1,691	529
South Carolina (1).....	84	70
South Dakota	2,664	1,675
Tennessee	1,671	4,571
Texas (1)	28,000	11,538
Utah (3)	5,257	4,889
Vermont (1)	541	1,067
Virginia (4)	987	987
Washington (3)	30,234	15,994
West Virginia (2).....	11,944	8,152
Wisconsin	25,917	40,053
Wyoming (1) (4).....	2,155	2,155
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	603,091	609,521

(1) Unofficial.

(2) For representative in congress.

(3) For United States senator.

(4) Vote for 1910.

(5) Vote for 1912.

CHAPTER XIII

THE NATIONAL PROGRAM

THE national program of the Socialist Party is set forth authoritatively in the official platform, which, after being adopted by the delegates to the National Convention, must also be passed by a referendum of the party membership. This document is here reproduced entire, as adopted by National Convention, May, 1912, and by membership referendum, August 4, 1912.

I. SOCIALIST PARTY PLATFORM

The representatives of the Socialist Party, in National Convention at Indianapolis, declare that the capitalist system has outgrown its historical function, and has become utterly incapable of meeting the problems now confronting society. We denounce this outgrown system as incompetent and corrupt and the source of unspeakable misery and suffering to the whole working-class.

Under this system the industrial equipment of the nation has passed into the absolute control of plutocracy, which exacts an annual tribute of hundreds of millions of dollars from the producers. Unafraid of any organized resistance, it stretches out its greedy hands over the still undeveloped resources of the nation—the land, the mines, the forests, and water-powers of every state in the Union.

In spite of the multiplication of labor-saving machines and improved methods in industry, which cheapen the cost of production, the share of the producers grows ever less, and the prices of all the necessities of life steadily increase. The boasted prosperity of this nation is for the owning class alone. To the rest it means only greater hardship and misery. The high cost

of living is felt in every home. Millions of wage-workers have seen the purchasing power of their wages decrease until life has become a desperate battle for mere existence.

Multitudes of unemployed walk the streets of our cities or trudge from state to state awaiting the will of the masters to move the wheels of industry.

The farmers in every state are plundered by the increasing prices exacted for tools and machinery and by extortionate rent, freight rates, and storage charges.

Capitalist concentration is mercilessly crushing the class of small business men and driving its members into the ranks of propertyless wage-workers. The overwhelming majority of the people of America are being forced under a yoke of bondage by this soulless industrial despotism.

It is this capitalist system that is responsible for the increasing burden of armaments, the poverty, slums, child labor, most of the insanity, crime, and prostitution, and much of the disease that afflicts mankind.

Under this system the working-class is exposed to poisonous conditions, to frightful and needless perils to life and limb, is walled around with court decisions, injunctions, and unjust laws, and is preyed upon incessantly for the benefit of the controlling oligarchy of wealth. Under it also the children of the working-class are doomed to ignorance, drudging toil, and darkened lives.

In the face of these evils, so manifest that all thoughtful observers are appalled at them, the legislative representatives of the Republican and Democratic parties remain the faithful servants of the oppressors. Measures designed to secure to the wage-earners of this nation as humane and just treatment as is already enjoyed by the wage-earners of all other civilized nations have been smothered in committee without debate, and laws ostensibly designed to bring relief to the farmers and general consumers are juggled and transformed into instruments for the exaction of further tribute. The growing unrest under oppression has driven these two old parties to the enactment of a variety of regulative measures, none of which has limited in any appreciable degree the power of the plutocracy, and some of which have been perverted into means for increasing that power. Anti-trust laws, railroad restrictions, and regulations, with the prosecutions, indictments, and investigations based upon such legislation, have proved to be utterly futile and ridiculous.

Nor has this plutocracy been seriously restrained or even threatened by any Republican or Democratic executive. It has continued to grow in power and insolence alike under the administrations of Cleveland, McKinley, Roosevelt, and Taft.

In addition to this legislative juggling and this executive connivance, the courts of America have sanctioned and strengthened the hold of this plutocracy as the Dred Scott and other decisions strengthened the slave-power before the Civil War. They have been used as instruments for the oppression of the working-class and for the suppression of free speech and free assembly.

We declare, therefore, that the longer sufferance of these conditions is impossible, and we purpose to end them all. We declare them to be the product of the present system in which industry is carried on for private greed, instead of for the welfare of society. We declare, furthermore, that for these evils there will be and can be no remedy and no substantial relief except through Socialism, under which industry will be carried on for the common good and every worker receive the full social value of the wealth he creates.

Society is divided into warring groups and classes, based upon material interests. Fundamentally, this struggle is a conflict between the two main classes, one of which, the capitalist class, owns the means of production, and the other, the working-class, must use these means of production on terms dictated by the owners.

The capitalist class, though few in numbers, absolutely controls the government—legislative, executive, and judicial. This class owns the machinery of gathering and disseminating news through its organized press. It subsidizes seats of learning—the colleges and schools—and even religious and moral agencies. It has also the added prestige which established customs give to any order of society, right or wrong.

The working-class, which includes all those who are forced to work for a living, whether by hand or brain, in shop, mine, or on the soil, vastly outnumbers the capitalist class. Lacking effective organization and class solidarity, this class is unable to enforce its will. Given such class solidarity and effective organization, the workers will have the power to make all laws and control all industry in their own interest.

All political parties are the expression of economic class interests. All other parties than the Socialist Party represent one

or another group of the ruling capitalist class. Their political conflicts reflect merely superficial rivalries between competing capitalist groups. However they result, these conflicts have no issue of real value to the workers. Whether the Democrats or Republicans win politically, it is the capitalist class that is victorious economically.

The Socialist Party is the political expression of the economic interests of the workers. Its defeats have been their defeats and its victories their victories. It is a party founded on the science and laws of social development. It proposes that, since all social necessities to-day are socially produced, the means of their production and distribution shall be socially owned and democratically controlled.

In the face of the economic and political aggressions of the capitalist class the only reliance left the workers is that of their economic organizations and their political power. By the intelligent and class-conscious use of these, they may resist successfully the capitalist class, break the fetters of wage-slavery, and fit themselves for the future society, which is to displace the capitalist system. The Socialist Party appreciates the full significance of class organization and urges the wage-earners, the working farmers, and all other useful workers everywhere to organize for economic and political action, and we pledge ourselves to support the toilers of the fields as well as those in the shops, factories, and mines of the nation in their struggles for economic justice.

In the defeat or victory of the working-class party in this new struggle for freedom lies the defeat or triumph of the common people of all economic groups, as well as the failure or triumph of popular government. Thus the Socialist Party is the party of the present-day revolution, which marks the transition from economic individualism to Socialism, from wage-slavery to free co-operation, from capitalist oligarchy to industrial democracy.

Working Program

As measures calculated to strengthen the working-class in its fight for the realization of its ultimate aim, the co-operative commonwealth, and to increase its power of resistance against capitalist oppression, we advocate and pledge ourselves and our elected officers to the following program:

Collective Ownership

1. The collective ownership and democratic management of railroads, wire and wireless telegraphs and telephones, express services, steamboat lines, and all other social means of transportation and communication, and of all large-scale industries.

2. The immediate acquirement by the municipalities, the states, or the federal government of all grain elevators, stock yards, storage warehouses, and other distributing agencies in order to reduce the present extortionate cost of living.

3. The extension of the public domain to include mines, quarries, oil wells, forests, and water-power.

4. The further conservation and development of natural resources for the use and benefit of all the people:

(a) By scientific forestation and timber protection.

(b) By the reclamation of arid and swamp tracts.

(c) By the storage of flood waters and the utilization of water-power.

(d) By the stoppage of the present extravagant waste of the soil and of the products of mines and oil wells.

(e) By the development of highway and waterway systems.

5. The collective ownership of land wherever practicable, and in cases where such ownership is impracticable, the appropriation by taxation of the annual rental value of all land held for speculation or exploitation.

6. The collective ownership and democratic management of the banking and currency system.

Unemployment

The immediate government relief of the unemployed by the extension of all useful public works. All persons employed on such works to be engaged directly by the government under a workday of not more than eight hours and at not less than the prevailing union wages. The government also to establish employment bureaus; to lend money to states and municipalities without interest for the purpose of carrying on public works, and to take such other measures within its power as will lessen the widespread misery of the workers caused by the misrule of the capitalist class.

Industrial Demands

The conservation of human resources, particularly of the lives and well-being of the workers and their families:

1. By shortening the workday in keeping with the increased productiveness of machinery.

2. By securing to every worker a rest period of not less than a day and a half in each week.

3. By securing a more effective inspection of workshops, factories, and mines.

4. By forbidding the employment of children under 16 years of age.

5. By the co-operative organization of the industries in the federal penitentiaries for the benefit of the convicts and their dependents.

6. By forbidding the interstate transportation of the products of child labor, of convict labor, and of all uninspected factories and mines.

7. By abolishing the profit system in government work and substituting either the direct hire of labor or the awarding of contracts to co-operative groups of workers.

8. By establishing minimum wage scales.

9. By abolishing official charity and substituting a non-contributory system of old-age pensions, a general system of insurance by the state of all its members against unemployment and invalidism, and a system of compulsory insurance by employers of their workers, without cost to the latter, against industrial diseases, accidents, and death.

Political Demands

1. The absolute freedom of press, speech, and assemblage.

2. The adoption of a graduated income tax, the increase of the rates of the present corporation tax, and the extension of inheritance taxes, graduated in proportion to the value of the estate and to nearness of kin—the proceeds of these taxes to be employed in the socialization of industry.

3. The abolition of the monopoly ownership of patents and the substitution of collective ownership, with direct rewards to inventors by premiums or royalties.

4. Unrestricted and equal suffrage for men and women.

5. The adoption of the initiative, referendum, and recall and of proportional representation, nationally as well as locally.

6. The abolition of the Senate and of the veto power of the President.

7. The election of the President and the Vice-President by direct vote of the people.

8. The abolition of the power usurped by the Supreme Court of the United States to pass upon the constitutionality of the legislation enacted by Congress. National laws to be repealed only by act of Congress or by a referendum vote of the whole people.

9. The abolition of the present restrictions upon the amendment of the Constitution, so that that instrument may be made amendable by a majority of the voters in the country.

10. The granting of the right of suffrage in the District of Columbia, with representation in Congress, and a democratic form of municipal government for purely local affairs.

11. The extension of democratic government to all United States territory.

12. The enactment of further measures for general education and particularly for vocational education in useful pursuits. The Bureau of Education to be made a department.

13. The enactment of further measures for the conservation of health. The creation of an independent bureau of health, with such restrictions as will secure full liberty to all schools of practice.

14. The separation of the present Bureau of Labor from the Department of Commerce and Labor and its elevation to the rank of a department.

15. Abolition of all federal district courts and the United States Circuit Courts of Appeals. State courts to have jurisdiction in all cases arising between citizens of the several states and foreign corporations. The election of all judges for short terms.

16. The immediate curbing of the power of the courts to issue injunctions.

17. The free administration of the law.

18. The calling of a convention for the revision of the Constitution of the United States.

Such measures of relief as we may be able to force from capitalism are but a preparation of the workers to seize the whole powers of government, in order that they may thereby lay

hold of the whole system of socialized industry and thus come to their rightful inheritance.

II. REPORT OF UNITED STATES CONGRESSMAN BERGER

The Socialist national program first entered into actual American politics with the election of Congressman Victor L. Berger, in 1910. The following is Mr. Berger's report in the 1912 convention:

The fall election of 1910 marked a new epoch in the history of the Socialist movement in America. A Socialist was elected to the Congress of the United States.

Naturally I considered it a great honor to be the first representative of the class-conscious proletariat of America in the halls of our national legislature. But having been in the fight for the emancipation of the working-class for almost a generation, I also at once realized the difficulty of my position. I was the only member of a much-feared and much-hated party in the lower House, with 391 other members of the House and 96 Senators absolutely and uncompromisingly opposed to me on all vital political and economic questions. . . .

The majority of the members of Congress belong to what I would call the upper middle class. . . .

As everybody knows, there are a few workingmen in the House of Representatives—about half a dozen so-called card men—men with union cards in their pockets. They do in no way, however, differ from the other representatives of the capitalist parties in their votes, argumentation, or method of thinking.

Practically all the work of Congress and of the House of Representatives is done in the committees. There is hardly any possibility of rejecting a bill that is proposed by the ruling party in the House of Representatives. Of course the bills are discussed in the committee of the whole and smaller amendments are occasionally agreed to. But, as a rule, the Democrats will vote absolutely with the Democratic leaders and the Republicans with the Republican leaders, and everyone knows beforehand what the fate of the bill is going to be when it is once reported to the House.

There is no such thing as an adverse or unfavorable report in the House. A bill reported always means favorably reported by the majority of the committee. If the minority disagrees it can make a minority report. Of the many thousand bills introduced only very few are reported.

Of the nearly 40,000 bills introduced in the preceding Congress, only 700 became law—the great majority of these were administrative acts of small importance to the country in general. Besides these, Congress passed about 6,000 private pension bills.

Such are the parliamentary conditions that confronted your first Socialist Congressman.

I could not afford to do or say anything that would make our cause and our party ridiculous before the many millions that are not yet with us. There was no precedent in the experience of any other party in our country to guide me, because ours was essentially a two-party country in the past—the People's Party never got a real first hold in Congress.

In Germany they always had many parties, and three Social Democrats were elected right from the beginning to the Reichstag in 1867, so that was no criterion to go by. Our parliamentarism is of an entirely different make-up. It is based upon the two-party system.

There were two ways before me. I could make a free-speech fight all alone, try to break down all precedent and all barriers, speak about the coming revolution and the co-operative commonwealth, as long as my lung power would hold out, and wind up my short parliamentary career by being suspended from the House, and thus also make an end to political action by this "direct action."

Or I could pursue the other course, obey all rules and precedents of the House until they are changed—get the respect and the attention of my fellow-members, speak sparingly and only when measures directly concerning the working-class are up for discussion, giving, however, close attention to all the business before the House of Representatives. This latter course I decided to follow—and this I did follow from the very beginning. (Italics ours.)

Owing to the unique position I held, however, I was from the

beginning called upon to do a greater variety of things than any other Congressman in Washington.

Not only did my correspondence grow to such enormous proportions that it kept three secretaries busy, although only about three per cent of this correspondence came from my district. But the answering of these letters was only one part of that work. I was also considered a court of last resort for a great number of men and women who had real or imaginary grievances against our government and our federal courts, or even against state governments and state courts. Moreover, I was the recipient of requests for investigations of all kinds in the various departments of our government, and of course was asked to protect numerous immigrants all over the country who were either to be sent back to Europe or were refused admission for various reasons, some of them being political refugees.

In each and all cases I did examine the evidence and the circumstances, and wherever there was even the slightest chance of making good on the case, I took it up with the respective departments. And I succeeded in very numerous instances.

The work of the departments was exceedingly laborious, and took a great deal of time, not only of myself, but also of my help-mates in the office. On this occasion I want to acknowledge my appreciation of the very valuable services of my secretary and comrade, Wm. J. Ghent, not only in answering letters, but in helping me to frame bills.

In the framing and introducing of bills embodying the demands of the platforms of the Socialist Party of America and of the Social Democratic Party of Wisconsin, I saw one of my most important duties—because thus I gave expression to the concrete demands as well as to the hopes and ambitions of my class. As to my votes in the House, I tried to follow strictly not only the letter but the spirit of our platform.

I may divide my work on general lines in legislative activities, work before committees, and departmental activities.

.

I have tried to do my duty fearlessly, faithfully, to the best of my light. You always want to keep before you that I was only one man with work enough for 300 Congressmen and 60 Senators and a President of the United States; that I was not only alone, but I had to hew my path through this "wilderness"

and had to overcome mountains of prejudice and a sea of ill-will. I believe that I have cleared a modest path on which other comrades can join me, which we can widen and which will finally wind up in a clear road for Socialism and the emancipation of the working-class as far as the legislative halls of our nation are concerned.

It is for you, comrades, and for the working-class to elect the many who will accomplish this.

CHAPTER XIV

THE STATE PROGRAMS

THE state programs of American Socialism have played a part in the political arena for some years, notably in Wisconsin, where Socialists have held legislative representation for a number of years. While the state organizations have complete autonomy, yet the National Convention, by appointing a committee to draw up a model state program, has made an attempt to secure harmony in the demands of the various sections.

I. REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON STATE PROGRAM, CONVENTION OF 1912

PREAMBLE

Socialism cannot be carried into full effect while the Socialist Party is a minority party. Nor can it be inaugurated in any single city. Furthermore, so long as national and state legislatures, and particularly the courts, are in the control of the capitalist class, a municipal administration, even though absolutely controlled by Socialists, will be hampered, crippled, and restricted in every possible way.

We maintain that the evils of the present system will be removed only when the working-class wholly abolish private ownership in the social means of production, collectively assume the management of the industries and operate them for use and not for profit, for the benefit of all and not for the enrichment of a privileged class. In this the Socialist Party stands alone in the political field.

But the Socialist Party also believes that the evils of the modern system may be materially relieved and their final disap-

pearance may be hastened by the introduction of social, political, and economic measures which will have the effect of bettering the lives, strengthening the position of the workers, and curbing the power and domination of the capitalists.

The Socialist Party therefore supports the struggles of the working-class against the exploitation and oppression of the capitalist class, and is vitally concerned in the efficiency of the parliamentary and administrative means for the fighting of the class struggle.

Furthermore, it should be distinctly understood that the following suggested municipal and state program is not put forth as mandatory or binding upon the state or local organizations. It is offered as suggestive data to assist those localities that may desire to use it, and as a basis for the activities of Socialist members of state legislatures and local administrations.

STATE PROGRAM

I

Labor Legislation

(1) An eight-hour day, trades-union scale, and minimum wage for both sexes.

(2) Legalization of the right to strike, picket, and boycott.

(3) Abolition of the injunction as a means of breaking strikes and the establishment of trial by jury in all labor disputes.

(4) Prohibition of the use of the military and the police power to break strikes.

(5) Prohibition of the employment of private detective agencies and police forces in labor disputes.

(6) The repeal of all military law which surrenders the power of the governor over the militia to the federal authorities.

(7) Requirements that in time of labor disputes advertisements for help published by employers shall contain notice of the fact that such labor dispute exists. Provision to be made for the prosecution of persons who shall employ workers without informing them that such labor trouble exists.

(8) Prohibition of employment of children under the age of 16, compulsory education, and the pensioning of widows with minor children where such provision is necessary.

(9) The organization of state employment agencies and rigid control of private agencies.

(10) Suitable safeguards and sanitary regulations in all occupations with ample provision for frequent and effective inspection of places of employment, machinery, and appliances.

(11) Old-age pensions, sick benefits, and accident insurance to be established.

(12) Workingmen's compensation laws to be carefully drawn to protect labor.

II

Home rule for cities.

III

Public Education

(1) Compulsory education of both sexes up to the age of 16 years with adequate provision for further courses where desired.

(2) Establishment of vocational and continuation schools and manual training for both sexes.

(3) Free text-books for teachers and pupils; uniform text-books on all subjects to be furnished free to public schools.

(4) Physical training through systematic courses of gymnastics and open-air exercises. Open-air schools and playgrounds.

IV

Taxation

(1) A graduated income tax; wages and salaries up to \$2,000 to be exempt.

(2) Graduated inheritance tax.

(3) All land held for speculation and all land not occupied or used by the owners to be taxed up to full rental value.

V

Public Works and Conservation

(1) For the purpose of developing and preserving the natural resources of the state and offering additional opportunities of labor to the unemployed, the states shall undertake a comprehensive system of public works, such as the building of roads,

canals, and the reclamation and irrigation of land. All forests, mineral lands, waterways, and natural resources now owned by the states to be conserved and kept for public use.

(2) The contract system shall be abolished in all public works, such work to be done by the state directly, all labor to be employed not more than eight hours per day at trade-union wages and under the best possible working conditions.

VI

Legislation

(1) The legislature of the state to consist of one house of representatives.

(2) The initiative, referendum, and recall to be enacted.

VII

Equal Suffrage

(1) Unrestricted political rights for men and women.

(2) Resident qualification for all elections not to exceed 90 days.

(3) The right to vote not to be contingent upon the payment of any taxes, either in money or labor.

VIII

Agriculture

(1) Extension of the State Agricultural and experimental farms for crop culture, for the distribution of improved seeds, for the development of fertilizers, for the design and introduction of the best types of farm machinery, and for the encouragement of the breeding of superior types of stock.

(2) All land owned by the state to be retained, and other land brought into public ownership and use by reclamation, purchase, condemnation, taxation, or otherwise: Such land to be organized into socially operated farms for the conduct of collective agricultural enterprises.

(3) Landlords to assess their own lands, the state reserving the right to purchase such lands at the assessed value.

(4) State insurance against pestilence, diseases of animals and plants, and against natural calamities.

IX

Defectives and Delinquents

(1) The present unscientific and brutal method of treating criminal persons, defectives, and delinquents to be replaced by modern scientific and humane methods. This to include the abolition of all death penalties, of the prison contract system, of isolated confinement. Penal institutions to be located in rural localities with adequate healthful open-air employment and humane treatment.

The above program is in general typical of those actually adopted by the different states. The extracts which follow will illustrate the variations and additions dictated by local conditions in New York, Montana, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin. In each case only such portions of the program are given as show an emphasis appreciably distinctive.

II. NEW YORK STATE PLATFORM, 1914

In the system of capitalism the condition of the workers is always precarious, and unemployment is chronic, but the present industrial depression, now particularly intensified, has made the evil unusually acute. Hosts of unemployed are forced to wander from one industrial center to another in desperate quest of work. As a consequence, homes are destroyed, wives and children deserted and left to starvation.

Our agricultural population is equally at the mercy of the exploiting class. The farm laborers are an intensely exploited group of workers, and even the so-called independent small farmer, like the wage-workers, is systematically plundered by the capitalist owner of the means of production. Rents on land, interest on mortgages, excessive transportation rates, storage and commission charges, extortionate prices exacted for farm implements and machinery, rob him as effectively of his product as the wage-worker of the industrial cities. . . .

1. SPECIAL DEMANDS

The enactment of a legal maximum workday of eight hours and its gradual shortening in keeping with the increased productiveness of modern machinery, and a rest period of a day and a half in each week for workers in all industries. . . .

Laws providing proper protection for the safety of the lives and health of the workers, and strict enforcement of such laws. For the latter purpose, inspectors elected by the workers in the respective industries should be provided in addition to the official state inspectors.

A system which shall provide state insurance to all workers against unemployment, sickness, invalidity, and old age, without contribution on the part of the workers, and state insurance for farmers against damage from diseases of animals and destruction of crops; the Compensation Act of the state to be amended to include all workers and to provide compensation equal to the full economic loss. . . .

Prohibition of employment of women during three months before and after childbirth, the state to reimburse the mother for loss of earnings during such period. State pensions to dependent mothers with children under the age of 16 years. . . .

2. POLITICAL DEMANDS

Equal suffrage for all adult men and women. . . . That all adult inhabitants of the United States be entitled to the exercise of the suffrage after three years' residence in this country, and the declaration of intentions to become a citizen of the United States.

Equal pay for equal work to men and women employed by the state or any of its subdivisions, and unrestricted right of such employees to organize. . . .

III. PENNSYLVANIA STATE PLATFORM, 1912

The Pennsylvania platform reflects state conditions in its demand for the abolition of the poll tax, and especially in its denunciation of the state constabulary, a force that has become extremely unpopular by its employment in the breaking of strikes.

IV. MONTANA STATE PLATFORM, 1912

SPECIAL DEMANDS

More efficient and scientific inspection of coal and metalliferous mines. . . . Six hours to be a day's labor for all underground workers and workers in the mills and smelters of the mining industries of this state.

Enactment of a law requiring a semi-monthly pay-day for wage-earners in all industries.

The abolition of the profit system in the state penitentiary, and the employment of the convicts in useful out-of-door labor. . . .

Coal lands owned by the state to be developed and operated by the state directly and the coal to be sold to municipalities and by them marketed to consumers directly at prices that cover, but no more than cover, the actual cost of such production and distribution.

Exemption from taxation and execution of real and personal property to the amount of \$1,500.

The portions just quoted from the Montana state platform are interesting in their care for the workers in mines. The demand for the exemption of small personal properties from taxation indicates that Socialism in Montana appeals to the small farmer and craftsman as well as to the wage-worker.

We print a large portion of the platform of Oklahoma, one of the strongest Socialist states.

V. OKLAHOMA STATE PLATFORM, 1912

SPECIAL DEMANDS

Art. 5. We denounce the Democratic Party for the deceit practiced upon the people of this state in promising to incorporate in the constitution of this state the initiative and referendum as adopted and applied in the state of Oregon, when in truth and in fact they wrote into the constitution provisions wholly different from the Oregon act; and afterwards passed

statutory laws that have practically destroyed the initiative and referendum in this state.

Art. 11. We promise the tenant and mortgaged farmer, and the working-class generally, that upon the accession of the Socialist Party to power in the state we will establish a state bank with branches at each county seat, and that all the moneys of the state and county and all moneys in the hands of the fiscal agencies shall be loaned to the working-class of the state through such banks.

Art. 12. We demand that the state shall engage in the business of life and fire insurance to the end that the citizenship of the state may obtain protection of this character at actual cost.

Art. 13. We demand the establishment of a state printing plant in which all public printing shall be done, including state, county, and other municipal records, and also the publishing of school books for the common schools to be furnished to the public school children free.

Art. 18. We demand that all mine inspectors shall neither be elected by the people nor appointed by the governor. The criminal loss of life in this state among the miners is directly traceable to inefficient supervision, and we demand that all mine inspectors shall be elected by the organized miners themselves, and the inspectors' salaries paid by the state. And we further demand similar provisions in behalf of the railway workers and workers in all other dangerous occupations.

Art. 19. . . . that provision shall be made for medical services and medicines at the expense of the state. And this shall not be construed in the light of charity, but as a partial restitution to the working-class for the robbery and exploitation suffered by them.

ART. 22. We urge upon the renters of this state that they organize on the industrial field into a renters' union for the betterment of their condition and to resist as best they may their ruthless exploitation by the landlord class.

ART. 24. Usury.—The Democratic Party has repeatedly promised the tenant and mortgaged farmers that it would place upon the statute books a usury law which would protect them against the exorbitant interest rates charged by the bankers of this state. We call the attention of the tenant and mortgaged farmers of the state to the fact that the Democratic Party has been faithless

to every such promise, and that by reason of such faithlessness they are now subjected to the most brutal exploitation by the money-lending class.

The last platform quoted, that of Wisconsin, is to be read in the light of the analysis which follows, compiled by Mr. Carl D. Thompson from first-hand information regarding this state. The Socialist group in the Wisconsin legislature is the only one that has passed from the stage of protest to that of actual law-making; and it will be noted that, in addition to the usual Socialist planks, its platform contains specific and detailed demands that stand a good chance of actual accomplishment. The liquor and white-slave problems are definitely touched upon. A declaration is also made regarding the merely palliative character of most of the reforms advocated and the necessity of moving on beyond them to real Socialism.

VI. WISCONSIN STATE PLATFORM, 1912

SPECIAL DEMANDS

Cities and villages shall be brought within the state banking law, to enable them to place their bonds on deposit with the state treasurer as collateral security, against which the city or village treasury may receive savings deposits, as is now customary with savings banks. This obviates the necessity of issuing municipal bonds of small denominations.

Assessment on rental value of land throughout the state, rather than on improvements.

An income tax based on unearned incomes only, graduated so as to increase the return to the state from the larger incomes. We condemn the present form of the income tax law, because it was intended to place a heavier burden directly upon the workers. The representatives of the Social Democratic Party did not propose to be held responsible for the defeat of income-tax legislation in the last legislature; but they are not responsible for all the provisions of the present law.

We condemn the attempt of the old parties to exempt the judiciary from the recall, and regard as ridiculous the assumed

sanctity and superior wisdom of persons who may happen to hold the office of judge.

We demand that all mineral rights reserved in title deeds be acquired by the state, exercising the right of eminent domain.

We demand that no land belonging to the state shall be sold; and that all land sold for taxes shall be bought by the state.

We demand the extension of the forest reserve; the erection and operation of state mills for handling the timber product, to the end that the cost of lumber to actual settlers and home owners may be reduced to the cost of production.

We demand adequate pay for members of the legislature.

We hold that intemperance in the use of liquor is the result of the present enervating economic conditions. With the growth of a people strong in physique, intellect, and popular morals, intemperance will gradually disappear and temperate habits in all things prevail. We condemn the attempts at sumptuary laws as inimical to the cause of economic and personal liberty. Until the profit system has been abolished and a more harmonious economic order has been established, the attempts of well-meaning people to introduce temperate habits by law will prove only an evasion of the real issue.

We recognize that capitalism is the cause of white slavery and prostitution. The only complete remedy, therefore, is to abolish the capitalist system. Nevertheless we support every measure tending to lessen this evil. We pledge our local officials to the fullest possible carrying out of the existing laws against the exploiters of this traffic.

Secure payment of wages in lawful money, not less often than once a week.

Safeguard the right of the worker, especially in lumber and mining camps, to spend his wages as he sees fit, and abolish company stores.

VII. SOCIALISTS IN THE WISCONSIN LEGISLATURE IN 1911

Mr. Carl Thompson has made a special analysis of the actual accomplishments of the Wisconsin Socialists in 1911, from which we give several paragraphs. Their program covers also a variety of social legislation, with definite accomplishments in several lines.

1. *Municipal Legislation.* Fourteen different bills introduced by the Socialists bearing upon this problem were passed during the session of 1911. These provided, among other things, for a greater degree of home rule for the city, secured the right of "excess condemnation," enabled the city to embark in the public ownership of certain public utilities, and gave it the right to secure land and property with which to begin the building of workingmen's homes.

2. *State Ownership.* The same year, the Socialists secured the passage of a joint resolution for a constitutional amendment, providing for the ownership by the state of the lands, mineral rights, water-powers, and other natural resources.

3. *Constitutional Convention.* They also secured the passage of a joint resolution calling for a national constitutional convention.

4. *Political Measures.* Socialists secured the passage of a law providing for a municipal initiative and referendum; another providing for a half-holiday on election days; another providing that women may use the voting machines.

5. *Public Utilities.* The Socialists secured the passage of a law repealing the "exclusive" clause in the franchise of the Milwaukee Gas Light Company; another legalizing the bonds issued by the city of Milwaukee for an electric lighting plant and declaring invalid certain injunctions brought against the city to restrain it from erecting the plant; another authorizing cities operating heating plants to install and operate pipes and mains in the same way as for waterworks.

CHAPTER XV

POLICY AND TACTICS

I. POLITICAL ACTION

THE general question as to the importance of political action in the class struggle is of such interest that we print several extracts from representative American Socialists. The first is from an article in a non-Socialist magazine by Victor Berger, the former Congressman, representing the extreme right or moderate wing of the party.

1. VICTOR BERGER

(From Article in *The American Magazine*, "Socialism, the Logical Outcome of Progressivism")

I have no hope that the Socialist Party will elect its candidate for President in this election. With us the Socialist movement and its principles are paramount—not the candidate.

The Socialist Party stands for the collective ownership of all the social means of production and distribution in the interest of the whole people.

Socialists say that this step is the necessary and natural outcome of the concentration of wealth and of the development of capitalism.

.

Political liberty and economic despotism are incompatible.

The Socialist Party proposed to supplement our political democracy by industrial democracy.

.

The Socialist Party has not a majority as yet. But Socialistic ideas have permeated the great majority. The trusts and economic evolution on one hand—and the natural discontent of the people

with the lowering of their standard of living on the other hand, are working for Socialism.

Therefore we laugh at the contention that the Socialist Party is still comparatively small. Every great party has had a small beginning—and the Socialist Party is growing exceedingly fast.

To the common citizen, the workingman, the underpaid clerk, the disappointed professional man,—to the disinherited of every description—we Socialists say:

Better vote for what you want, even if you do not get it, than vote for what you do not want and get it!

Why should we wait with our work until the majority of the votes is with us? The majority is always indolent and often ignorant. We cannot expect them to be anything else with their present social surroundings.

The majority have never brought about consciously and deliberately any great social change. They have always permitted an energetic minority to prepare the way. But the majority was always there when the fact itself was to be accomplished.

Therefore, our sole object in state and nation for the next few years is to elect a respectable minority of Socialists.

We want a Socialist minority respected on account of its numbers,—respected because it represents the most advanced economic and political intelligence of the day—respected because it contains the most sincere representatives of the proletariat, the class that has the most to gain and nothing to lose.

Given such a respectable minority in Congress and in the legislature of every state of the Union within the next few years—the future of our people, the future of this country will be safe. (Italics ours.)

2. CHARLES EDWARD RUSSELL

The next selection is from Charles Edward Russell, who polled a large vote for governor of New York State in 1912. (From "Rational Political Action," *International Socialist Review*, March, 1912.)

When I was a Washington correspondent some years ago there fell under my observation of the shifting show two facts about government by a political machine that seemed to me fairly illuminating.

The first was that while it was one of the dullest of all human devices it was endowed with extraordinary power to bedevil and frustrate good intentions.

For instance, one of the most familiar spectacles was the young member that had come to his first term in Congress with really high ideals and a sincere purpose to be straight and serve the people. In every case the machine made short work of such a one. . . .

The second fact was that judged merely on the basis of efficiency and nothing higher, the machine style of government was a failure. . . . No matter which party might be in power, the result was always the same. The party would come in with a program and a lot of beautiful promises and then fail utterly to carry them out. It could not carry them out, even when it wished, even when they were plainly advisable, for the reason that the machine style of government was a worthless instrument. . . . The party in power had no tool. It was tied up with a system, and that system was the real government; the rest was but a counterfeit, and would be so long as structural conditions remained unchanged.

It made no difference how progressive and admirable might be the ideas that were sought to be established. . . . The Populist Party had an admirable program; it aimed far above the greasy thought of its day and stood for a measure of real democracy and political and industrial democracy and political and industrial freedom. . . . Having some of the best purposes that up to its time had ever been enunciated in a platform, it went the road to destruction because it insisted upon playing the game and getting entangled with the system.

It went out to get offices and put men into jobs. That finished it.

Seeing so many of these wrecks about me, a vague notion began to form in my mind that this was not the best way to effect things; the system wasted too much in time and effort and never arrived. So long as a party made its object the getting of votes and the filling of offices it would land where the Populist Party had landed, and that no matter how lofty might be its aims.

Much as we used to make fun of it (under orders from headquarters) we knew that it had a rational and admirable program and that it never ought to have gone to smash. But that is just

where it went, nevertheless, through trying to get into the dirty game on the bargain counter. *Suppose, instead, that it had kept itself intact and independent, standing aloof and insisting always upon its ideas as the only salvation for the nation.* It could have raised in this country an incomparable amount of trouble, it could have seen a handful of its ideas put into practical operation and itself a vital power instead of a sign of laughter.

This was felt by more than one of us, though we did not go far enough to formulate a basic idea of it. Some years afterward I found the identical thing lucidly and firmly expressed in one of Wendell Phillips' incomparable orations. "Give me," said Mr. Phillips, "fifty thousand men that will stand together, shoulder to shoulder, without compromise and without surrender, insisting upon an ideal, and they will rule the nation with their ideas." (*Italics ours.*)

3. WILLIAM D. HAYWOOD IN COOPER UNION

We quote next from William D. Haywood, representing the extreme left wing of the party, in a speech at Cooper Union, New York. (From the *International Socialist Review*, February, 1913.)

Socialism is so plain, so clear, so simple that when a person becomes intellectual he doesn't understand Socialism. (Applause.)

I am not here to waste time on the "immediate demanders" or the step-at-a-time people whose every step is just a little shorter than the preceding step. (Laughter and applause.) I am here to speak to the working-class, and the working-class will understand what I mean when I say that *under Socialism you will need no passports or citizenship papers to take a part in the affairs in which you are directly interested.* The working-class will understand me when I say that Socialism is an industrial democracy and that industrialism is a social democracy.

Under Socialism we workers will not be subjects of any state or nation, but we will be citizens, free citizens in the industries in which we are employed.

I want to say at this point, and emphatically, that *with the success of Socialism practically all of the political offices now in existence will be put out of business.* (Applause.) I want to say also, and with as much emphasis, that *while a member of the Socialist Party and believing firmly in political action, it is decidedly better in my opinion to be able to elect the superintendent in some branch of industry than to elect a Congressman to the United States Congress.* (Applause.) More than that: under Socialism we will have no congresses, such as exist to-day, nor legislatures, nor parliaments, nor councils of municipalities.

But remember! We also [in Cripple Creek] *believed in political action, and had elected one of our own class as governor of the state.* And he called out the militia to protect the miners and put them in between the warring factions and told the deputy sheriffs that if they didn't disband he would fire on them as insurrectos. *You understand, then, why I believe in political action.* (Applause.) *We will have control then of whatever forces government can give us, but we will not use them to continue to uphold and advance this present system, but we will use the forces of the police power to overthrow this present system.* (Applause.) And instead of using the powers of the police to protect the strike-breakers, we will use the powers of the police to protect the strikers. (Applause.) That's about as far as I go on political action. (Applause.) But that's a long way. *And the reason that I don't go into the halls of Parliament to make laws to govern the working-class is because the working-class is working with machines, and every time some fellow has a thought, inspiration, the machine changes, and I don't know that laws can be made quick enough to keep up with the changing machinery.* And I know this: that laws, under Socialism, will not be made to govern individuals. We have got too much of that kind of law, and we want a little freedom from now on. The only kind of government that we will have then will be that kind that will administer industry. (Our italics.)

4. EUGENE V. DEBS

The declarations of Eugene V. Debs regarding political action, as on many other matters, may be taken as repre-

senting the views of the great majority of American Socialists. (From "Sound Socialist Tactics," *International Socialist Review*, February, 1910.)

While the "game of politics," as it is understood and as it is played under capitalist rules, is as repugnant to me as it can possibly be to anyone, *I am a thorough believer in political organization and political action.*

Political power is essential to the workers in their struggle, and they can never emancipate themselves without developing and exercising that power in the interests of their class.

It is not merely in a perfunctory way that I advocate political action, but as one who has faith in proletarian political power and in the efficacy of political propaganda as an educational force in the Socialist movement. *I believe in a constructive political program and in electing all the class-conscious workers we can, especially as mayors, judges, sheriffs, and as members of the state legislatures and the national congress.*

From "A Plea for Solidarity," *International Socialist Review*, March, 1914:

At bottom all anti-political actionists are to all intents anarchists, and anarchists and Socialists have never yet pulled together and probably never will.

Now the industrial organization that ignores or rejects political action is as certain to fail as is the political party that ignores or rejects industrial action. Upon the mutually recognized unity and co-operation of the industrial and political powers of the working-class will both the union and the party have to be built if real solidarity is to be achieved.

To deny the political equation is to fly in the face of past experience and invite a repetition of the disruption and disaster which have already wrecked the organized forces of industrialism.

The anti-political unionist and the anti-union Socialist are alike illogical in their reasoning and unscientific in their economics. The one harbors the illusion that the capitalist state can be destroyed and its police powers, court injunctions, and gatling guns, in short its political institutions, put out of business by letting politics alone, and the other that the industries can be taken over and operated by the workers without being industrially

organized and that the Socialist republic can be created by a majority of votes and by political action alone.

It is beyond question, I think, that an overwhelming majority of industrial unionists favor independent political action and that an overwhelming majority of Socialists favor industrial unionism. Now it seems quite clear to me that these forces can and should be united and brought together in harmonious and effective economic and political co-operation.

Let us suppose in this country a political party with a program that proposes a great and radical transformation of the existing system of society, and proposes it upon lofty grounds of the highest welfare of mankind. Let us suppose that it is based upon vital and enduring truth and that the success of its ideals would mean the emancipation of the race.

If such a party should go into the dirty game of practical politics . . . it would inevitably fall into the pit that has engulfed all other parties. Nothing on earth could save it. It would be adopting the iron-walled path of the machine system of government and down that path it must inevitably go, for from it there is absolutely no escape, and at its end is ruin.

But suppose a party that kept forever in full sight the ultimate goal and never once varied from it. Suppose that it strove to increase its vote for this object and for none other. Suppose its membership to be held together by the inspiration of that purpose, to be informed of it and prepared to work for it unswervingly, to wait for it if necessary. Suppose this party at all times to insist in its agitation upon this object and to proclaim that it would never be content for one moment with anything else; that this reform and that reform were well enough for other parties but for this particular party nothing would be accepted but the fullest measure of its ideals. Suppose that by agitation, propaganda, education, literature, campaigns, meetings, a party press, and every means in its power it steadily increased its membership and its vote. Suppose it regarded its vote as the index of its converts and sought for such votes and for none others. Suppose the entire body was convinced of the party's full program, aims, and philosophy. Suppose that all other men knew that this growing party was thus convinced and thus determined, and that its growth menaced every day more and more the existing structure of society, menaced it with overthrow and a new structure. What then?

Such a party would be the greatest political power that ever existed in this or any other country. It would drive the other parties before it like sand before a wind. They would be compelled to adopt one after another the expedients of reform to head off the increasing threat of this one party's progress toward the revolutionary ideal. But *this one party would have no more need to waste its time upon palliative measures than it would have to soil itself with the dirt of practical politics and the bargain counter.* The other parties would do all that and do it well. The one party would be concerned with nothing but making converts to its philosophy and preparing for the revolution that its steadfast course would render inevitable. Such a party would represent the highest possible efficiency in politics, the greatest force in the state, and the ultimate triumph of its full philosophy would be beyond question.

In other words, and to drop all supposition, we can have a vote-getting machine and go to perdition with it; or we can have the Co-operative Commonwealth and working-class government. But we cannot have both. (Our italics.)

II. PARTY ORGANIZATION

Several questions of controversy have centered about the matter of party organization, as set forth in the National Constitution. As it is impossible to give this constitution at length, we give only those sections which have been the subjects of recent referendums or which throw definite light on the party tactics.

The portion of the constitution that has caused most serious discussion is Article II, Section 6, relating to sabotage and its advocacy. The debate on this section in the National Convention will be given at some length below. When the constitution was submitted to referendum of the party, the opposition to the section took the form rather of a defense of free speech than of a defense of sabotage, and accordingly the vote on the referendum can hardly be said to be an index of the party opinion of sabotage. The section was carried by a large majority,

but the fact that a substitute section also received a majority has given rise to still further criticism of the vote as a definitive expression.

1. THE CONSTITUTION OF THE SOCIALIST PARTY (EXTRACTS)

Amended by the National Convention of the party, May, 1912, and approved by referendum August 4, 1912.

.

ARTICLE II

Membership

Sec. 1. Every person, resident of the United States of the age of 18 years and upward, without discrimination as to sex, race, color, or creed, who has severed his connection with all other political parties and political organizations, and subscribes to the principles of the Socialist Party, including political action and unrestricted political rights for both sexes, shall be eligible to membership in the party.

Sec. 2. No person holding an elective public office by gift of any party or organization other than the Socialist Party shall be eligible to membership in the Socialist Party; nor shall any member of the party accept or hold any appointive public office, honorary or remunerative (civil service positions excepted), without the consent of his state organization. No party member shall be a candidate for public office without the consent of the city, county, or state organizations, according to the nature of the office.

Sec. 5. *All persons joining the Socialist Party shall sign the following pledge:* "I, the undersigned, recognizing the class struggle between the capitalist class and the working-class and the necessity of the working-class constituting itself into a political party distinct from and opposed to all parties formed by the capitalist class, hereby declare that I have severed my relations with all other parties, and I indorse the platform and constitution of the Socialist Party, including the principle of political action, and hereby apply for admission to said party."

Sec. 6. *Any member of the party who opposes political action*

or advocates crime, sabotage, or other methods of violence as a weapon of the working-class to aid in its emancipation shall be expelled from membership in the party. Political action shall be construed to mean participation in elections for public office and practical legislative and administrative work along the lines of the Socialist Party platform.*

ARTICLE X

Sec. 3. *The platform of the Socialist Party shall be the supreme declaration of the party, and all state and municipal platforms shall conform thereto. No state or local organization shall under any circumstances fuse, combine, or compromise with any other political party or organization, or refrain from making nominations, in order to favor the candidate of such other organizations, nor shall any candidate of the Socialist Party accept any nomination or indorsement from any other party or political organization.*

No member of the Socialist Party shall, under any circumstances, vote in primary or regular elections for any candidate other than Socialists nominated, indorsed, or recommended as candidates by the Socialist Party. To do otherwise will constitute party treason and result in expulsion from the party.

Sec. 4. *In states and territories in which there is one central organization affiliated with the party, the state or territorial organizations shall have the sole jurisdiction of the members residing within their respective territories, and the sole control of all matters pertaining to the propaganda, organization, and financial affairs within such state or territory; provided such propaganda is in harmony with the national platform and declared policy of the party.*

Sec. 8. *All state organizations shall provide in their constitutions for the initiative, referendum, and imperative mandate.*

All sections and paragraphs of the constitution, platform, and resolutions were adopted, most of them by large majorities.

** The vote on Article II, Section 6, of the constitution, the original section as adopted by the Convention, was, Yes, 13,215;*

No, 4,196. The vote on the alternative or substitute section was, Yes, 8,216; No, 7,371.* (Our italics.)

2. AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION

During the year 1914 two important amendments to the constitution were passed. The first of these related to the party press.

a. *The Party-Owned Press*

All fear of the party-owned-press bugaboo was practically wiped out when the Socialist Party national committee meeting here voted 45 to 10 to convert *The Party Builder*, the official party organ, into a weekly Socialist paper.

The motion of Committeeman Hillquit as adopted was:

That it be the sense of this committee that *The Party Builder* be converted into a weekly Socialist paper along the line suggested by the committee and that the national executive committee be directed to make inquiries as to the cost and feasibility of the undertaking and to proceed with it as soon as practical in view of the financial situation of the party. (*The Party Builder*, May 16, 1914.)

In harmony with the above action, Article VII, Section 3, was amended so as to read as follows:

The executive secretary shall cause to be published in the official organ of the party all important official reports and announcements; a monthly report of the financial affairs of the party; a summary of the conditions and the membership of the several states and territorial organizations; the principal business transacted by the national officials, and such other matters pertaining to the organization of the party as may be of general interest to the membership.

As a result of this amendment *The Party Builder* has

* *S. P. Bulletin*, September, 1912.

been converted into a weekly paper, *The American Socialist*.

b. *Change in the Members' Pledge*

The following change in the membership pledge was also adopted:

NEW ARTICLE II—SECTION 5

All persons joining the Socialist Party shall sign the following pledge:

APPLICATION FOR MEMBERSHIP IN THE SOCIALIST PARTY

I, the undersigned, recognizing the class struggle between the capitalist class and the working-class, and the necessity of the working-class organizing itself into a political party for the purpose of obtaining collective ownership and democratic administration and operation of the collectively used and socially necessary means of production and distribution, hereby apply for membership in the Socialist Party.

I have no relations (as member or supporter) with any other political party.

I am opposed to all political organizations that support and perpetuate the present capitalist profit system, and I am opposed to any form of trading or fusing with any such organizations to prolong that system.

In all my political actions while a member of the Socialist Party I agree to be guided by the constitution and platform of that party.

III. PROPOSED UNION OF AMERICAN SOCIALIST PARTIES

Since 1900 there have been two Socialist Parties in the United States, the present Socialist Party, with a membership of about one hundred thousand, and the Socialist Labor Party, from which the former is an offshoot, but which has dwindled to about one thousand members. For a generation the leader of the Socialist Labor Party was the late Daniel De Leon, editor of the official organ, *The*

People. (From the Report of the Socialist Party Delegation to the International Socialist Congress, Copenhagen, 1910.)

Daniel De Leon, speaking on the Unity resolution, charged that the Socialist Labor Party had made offers of unity to the Socialist Party, but that they had been rejected by the Socialist Party.

Morris Hillquit replied to De Leon. In part, he said: "The Socialist Party in America stands for the union of all Socialist forces in the United States. It does not stand for this simply in a platonic manner, but has shown its sincerity by its deeds. Our party is itself the product of unity. In 1900 the Socialist movement of America was split into various parties and groups. The Socialist Party became the center of unity and invited all Socialist organizations to send delegates to the Unity Convention of 1901. All such organizations responded with the exception of that wing of the Socialist Labor Party which was headed by De Leon."

Replying also to De Leon, Victor L. Berger said: "The American Socialists are unanimous for unity. We will vote for the Unity resolution and promise you that within the next three years we will completely solve the unity question, for by that time only De Leon himself will stand outside the party. We in America are also working all the time for unity." (Our italics.)

Daniel De Leon, leader of the Socialist Labor Party, died in the spring of 1914.

In 1914 the Socialist Party of New Jersey passed resolutions urging the union of the Socialist Labor Party and the Socialist Party.

The following paragraph is from Eugene V. Debs' article, "A Plea for Solidarity," in the *International Socialist Review*, March, 1914:

On the political field there is no longer any valid reason why there should be more than one party. I believe that a majority of both the Socialist Party and the Socialist Labor Party would vote for consolidation, and I hope to see the initiative taken by

the rank and file of both at an early day. The unification of the political forces would tend to clear the atmosphere and promote the unification of the forces on the industrial field.

A referendum has been proposed by certain locals, and is now under consideration, to the effect that a committee of five from the Socialist Labor Party be invited to meet a similar committee from the Socialist Party, with a view to union.

(See also "Militarism," "Trusts," "Proportional Representation," "Woman Suffrage," "Tariffs," "Government Ownership," "Labor Unions," "Labor Legislation," "Co-operation," "Immigration and the Race Question," "The Drink Question.")

CHAPTER XVI

SOCIALISM IN CANADA

I. HISTORY OF CANADIAN SOCIALIST PARTY

IN the year 1890 a group of men dissatisfied with both Liberal and Conservative program and methods gathered in Montreal for the purpose of forming a new political organization, and organized a local of the Socialist Labor Party of America. This is the first group of men known to have organized under the banner of Socialism. Locals were afterwards formed in other cities. The executive was established in Montreal.

On the 18th of May, 1899, the Canadian Socialist League was organized in Montreal as a result of dissatisfaction with the methods of the executive of the Socialist Labor Party in New York, and also as a result of a desire to establish a Canadian Socialist movement. The movement grew rapidly, about 60 leagues being established in Ontario. The executive was moved from Montreal to Toronto and afterwards to Vancouver.

In 1901 the Socialist Party of British Columbia was formed, and made good progress. In 1905 the Socialist Party of Canada was established as a result of a coalition between the Socialist Party of British Columbia and the Canada Socialist Leagues. The headquarters of the party was in Vancouver. The *Western Clarion* became the official organ.

The growth of the Socialist Party of Canada is shown

by a table of the vote since 1903, compiled by W. Watts for the *Western Clarion*. The table is as follows:

Dates	Votes received	Dates	Votes received
1903.....	3,507	1910.....	10,929
1907.....	3,670	1911.....	15,852
1908.....	8,697	1912.....	15,857
1909.....	9,688	1913.....	17,071

“The first notable election took place in the Province of British Columbia in 1903. From then on the elections have been contested stoutly and with excellent results, till in the election of 1913 the Socialists cast 15 per cent of the total vote.

“The movement has unusual difficulties. Not the least of these is the Labor Party. Another is the strong influence of the Catholic Church in the Dominion and the general state of agricultural prosperity.”

II. THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA IN 1914

By J. H. Borough, Dominion Secretary

“At present we have no parliamentary representatives. In the past we have had four in the legislature of British Columbia, these being gradually reduced by the unscrupulous tactics of the capitalist politicians in whose hands rests the administration of the election acts, and by the action of the large employers of labor in the mining centers of the province in shutting down their works about a month previous to election, in order that our supporters might be compelled to leave the district in search for other jobs. This has been done repeatedly, with—to them—satisfactory results. In addition to this difficulty, this province contains the largest proportion of migratory workers of any in the Dominion. . . .

“The vote has increased from 3,500 in 1903 to approxi-

mately 9,000 in 1912 in British Columbia, the Vancouver vote rising from 1,611 in 1903 to 5,767 in 1912.

“In Alberta, the second province in membership and first in organization, we have only secured as yet one seat. This was in the Rocky Mountain district, partly a mining and partly an agricultural district. The seat was captured in March, 1909, by Comrade C. M. O’Brien by a small majority. In the succeeding election (1913) the seat was lost, the boundaries having been especially altered to secure that result. The majority of the miners were out. In the Dominion elections of 1908, the party in Alberta ran two candidates and received 1,300 votes. In the provincial elections of 1909 it ran two, receiving 1,400 votes. In the provincial elections of 1911, three candidates were placed on the ticket, receiving 2,300 votes. . . .

“At the general elections in Manitoba in July, 1914, the party nominated two candidates in center Winnipeg, who received 928 and 921 votes respectively, notwithstanding the fact that it had to encounter the opposition of all kinds of reform candidates with and without the misleading cognomen of ‘Labor.’ ”

III. EXTRACT FROM PLATFORM OF THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

(Extract)

We call upon all workers to organize under the banner of the Socialist Party of Canada, with the object of conquering the public powers for the purpose of setting up and enforcing the economic program of the working-class, as follows:

1. The transformation, as rapidly as possible, of capitalistic property in the means of wealth production (natural resources, factories, mills, railroads, etc.) into the collective property of the working-class.

2. The democratic organization and management of industry by the workers.

3. The establishment, as speedily as possible, of production for use instead of production for profit.

The Socialist Party when in office shall always and everywhere until the present system is abolished, make the answer to this question its guiding rule of conduct: Will this legislation advance the interests of the working-class and aid the workers in their class struggle against capitalism? If it will, the Socialist Party is for it; if it will not, the Socialist Party is absolutely opposed to it.

In accordance with this principle the Socialist Party pledges itself to conduct all the public affairs placed in its hands in such a manner as to promote the interests of the working-class alone.

IV. HISTORY OF THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY

The provincial convention of the Socialist Party held at Toronto on May 24, 1910, gave birth to a new party in Ontario, which has since spread from Atlantic to Pacific. Owing to the autocratic position taken by the executive of the Socialist Party of Canada at Vancouver in expelling the Toronto local, consisting of 210 members, 13 other locals seceded with about 700 members, and in April, 1911, at Toronto, was organized the present Social Democratic Party of Canada. This organization has spread to almost every province, until to-day it consists of 230 locals, 82 in Ontario, 46 in British Columbia, 45 in Alberta, 20 in Saskatchewan, 28 in Manitoba, 8 in Quebec, and 1 in Nova Scotia. The headquarters is at Berlin, Ontario. It has a membership of over five thousand and a paid secretary. In British Columbia two members have been elected to the House, Jack Place for Nanaimo and Parker Williams for Ladysmith, both members of the party.

In 1912 the party affiliated with the International Bureau. James Simpson is a member of the board of control of Toronto. Niagara Falls has one Socialist alderman. At Lindsay a member of the party has been mayor for two

years. In the Ontario election held on June 29, 1914, the total vote ran over 6,000, with 14 candidates in the field. In July the Social Democratic Party candidate in Winnipeg, Manitoba, received 2,000 votes to 2,500 for the Liberal and 3,000 for the Conservative.

V. EXTRACT FROM PLATFORM OF THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF CANADA

As a means of preparing the minds of the working-class for the inauguration of the co-operative commonwealth, the Social Democratic Party of Canada will support any measure that will tend to better conditions under capitalism, such as:

- (1) Reduction of hours of labor.
- (2) The elimination of child labor.
- (3) Universal adult suffrage without distinction of sex or regard to property qualifications; and
- (4) The initiative, referendum, and right of recall.

VI. THE LABOR MOVEMENT IN CANADA *

“It has often been a matter of surprise to political observers that the labor movement has made such comparatively little progress in Canada; its political success, at any rate, has been relatively small. At present it is represented by one member in the Dominion House and by one in each of the Ontario and British Columbia Legislatures. Once the great western city of Winnipeg elected a labor representative, through the co-operation of the Liberals, but on the whole the political influence of the Labor Party is slight. While the electoral strength which it exhibits at the polls increases year by year, its actual effect upon the monopoly of the two historic parties has been sadly limited. What are the reasons to account for the backwardness of the labor movement in Canada as compared with

* *The New Statesman*, July 18, 1914—signed J. A. S.

its progress and strength in the other Dominions? They are many.

"In the first place, the trade-unions in Canada are all more or less affiliated to the American labor organizations. The geographical condition of the two countries necessitates this. Unless a Canadian union had the guarantee of the co-operation of its coordinate American union its powers of negotiating or striking would be definitely limited and in the end ineffective. But what is a benefit for economic warfare is a barrier to political success, inasmuch as it brings the labor movement into definite opposition to the sentiment of Canadian nationalism. There are a great many of the Canadian working-classes who have a strong sense of prejudice, often ill-founded, against American institutions, and, believing that the Canadian trade-unions are more or less subservient to the vaster American organizations, hold aloof from them. . . .

"The Labor Party, too, has suffered too often by the defection of its leaders to the capitalist ranks. If they were clever men they saw before them facile opportunities of making money and speedily acquired an economic security which put them out of sympathy with their less fortunate brethren. Great corporations, too, assist in this process, and if they see any young man coming forward as a leader of his fellow-employees they have a wise habit of offering him a comfortable executive job which removes him to another sphere. All these causes have contributed to the comparative failure of the Labor Party to make the same headway that it has achieved in the other overseas democracies.

"But there are signs that a change is now in sight. Canada has been suffering from a period of financial stringency and her expansion has been very severely curtailed. . . . The workingman may have higher wages than in the older

countries, but the advantage is completely destroyed by the tremendous cost of living. Labor in Great Britain complains that within the last decade the cost of living has gone up 15 per cent, but during the same period in Canada it has increased 51 per cent, and there has been no proportionate increase in wages. Most ominous of all is it that while in Great Britain and the United States the most recent index tables show some decrease in the cost of living, in Canada the upward rise relentlessly continues. Ten years ago it was possible for workingmen in Winnipeg to secure comfortable houses at a rent of \$8 per month; now the meanest abode costs at least \$16 per month. All these factors have begun to bring the laboring-class to a sense of their true position and to realize that migration to a new country of vast undeveloped resources has in many cases failed to improve their economic position. There is now a decided demand for better terms for labor, and labor is beginning to realize that better terms can only be secured by political action. Neither of the existing parties shows any decided inclination to meet these demands, and as a result labor is beginning to strike out for itself. There have, of course, been many active and capable leaders of Canadian labor, and if the parliamentary success of such as have been elected to Parliament has been inconspicuous it was largely due to the lack of a real, driving, well-organized force behind them. But in every city there are signs of an awakening. In Montreal, Mr. Alphonse Ber-ville, who is a Liberal-Labor representative and a very outspoken democrat, represents by a huge majority Mais-soneuve, which is the largest constituency in Canada, and held it at the reciprocity election in face of determined attacks. At the last municipal election in Toronto a Socialist was elected as one of the city controllers, and in Winnipeg Mr. R. A. Rigg, the leader of the Labor Party,

was chosen as an alderman. In Vancouver and other Pacific coast communities there has always been a strong Socialist element which elects some representatives to the local House and municipal offices. . . .” *

* In 1912 the “Independent Labor Party” elected a Socialist, Allan Studholme, to the provincial parliament of Ontario. The member of the Dominion Parliament above referred to was a member of the “Labor Party.”

CHAPTER XVII

CENTRAL AND SOUTH AMERICA

I. MEXICO

1. ADDRESS OF GUITTERREZ DE LARA OF MEXICO, 1912 *

“COMRADE CHAIRMAN and Comrades, I come here to this convention as a fraternal delegate of the Socialist Party in Mexico. I have a mission in coming. . . . Our comrades in Mexico have indorsed the principles of the revolution. . . . They called on me to come here and explain to you about our revolution, and to ask you to pass some energetic resolutions in regard to it.

“Comrades, the revolution in Mexico is a fight of the past hundred years. It is the fight of the farmers, the tillers of the soil, who became the owners of the lands that they are tilling. A hundred years ago the revolution in Spain was carried out by the tillers of the soil to get the lands from the big landowners in Mexico at that time. The big landowners were the church and the aristocracy. After 10 years of revolution, independence was recognized. But the revolutionists were not wise enough to carry out the revolution in a practical way. They were tender and satisfied to have an independent country and a flag. But soon they realized that they had not been fighting for such a small question as that. So they went ahead with the revolution, and about 15 years later, that is, in the year 1834, they were very nearly in a position to take away the

* The following address was delivered at the 1912 convention of the Socialist Party of the United States.

land of the church and give it to the common people. If they did not accomplish this, why not? Because the church was not only the big landowner in Mexico, but also controlled the conscience in that country, and you know how hard it is for the agitator to take away from a man the idea of his wealth in heaven and his poverty on earth. . . .

“The church went to work, and was able to elect as president a man that came to enforce its rights of the church and the aristocracy. But this man found that he was unable to destroy the rights of the revolutionists; that the people had a higher passion in their hearts, the passion of patriotism, and that patriotism was arousing the Mexican people to become an American nation.

“In the meantime, in the United States the slave-holders, who needed to increase the power of slavery, tried to arouse the patriotism of the American people by an international war. There was a common understanding between the slave-owners in the United States and the landowners in Mexico that an international war would make the common people of Mexico forget the issue of the ownership of the Mexican lands and make the American people forget the issue of the emancipation of the slave. . . .

“After the war was over, the Mexican people, defeated, were unable to carry on the revolutionary issue of the ownership of the land by the toilers of the soil. . . .

“So . . . another revolution started in Mexico. . . . This new revolution of the fifties was for the purpose of . . . framing a new constitution that would embody the necessities and the aspirations of the common people in Mexico. That new constitution, which is the constitution of to-day, was proclaimed on the 5th of February, 1857, and . . . gave to us all the freedom that we needed; free speech, free press, and free compulsory education. But the great

point . . . was that it took away the land from the church, proclaiming that the church, being a divine institution, had not the right to own anything else. So about two and a half to three millions of toilers of the soil thus became owners of independent lands.

“Immediately on the adoption of this constitution, the wealthy class of Mexico, the church and the aristocracy, found that a tremendous blow had been struck against them. The church and aristocracy claimed the army in Mexico in those years. . . . There was a civil war of three years between the church and army and the common people, and after it the common people were able to entirely defeat the church and the aristocracy. When the church and aristocracy surrendered, then they sent delegates to Europe to ask help in order that the European powers might send their armies to Mexico for the purpose of restoring the lands to the church and to the aristocracy.

“In the year 1861, England, France, and Spain agreed to send their armies to Mexico, and those armies were sent. But as soon as England and Spain realized their mistake and the trouble they were likely to have on their hands, they withdrew their armies. But France . . . invaded Mexico and placed Emperor Maximilian in power. This invasion was nothing else but a tool used by the Mexican church and Mexican aristocracy, and a tool also used by the Pope of Rome and the Emperor of France in order that they might come and, in the name of some farcical laws, take away the lands from the common people and restore them to the church and aristocracy.

“This international war lasted about nine years, and you who read Mexican history from an economic standpoint can see how by this time the Mexican people had twice been able to accomplish the fact of giving the lands to the common people. A foreign invader had come into Mexico,

but had been compelled to surrender after having come to give back the lands to the church and aristocracy. That has been the only purpose of Mexican foreign wars. After the French war was over, the Mexican people were entirely broken down by those nine years of war. A republic was established, and the people began to take up the question of the lands.

"But after a few years the church took back the stranger and allied with the aristocracy and the army. . . . After a while they succeeded and gained power, but they were foxy enough to understand that by this time the church was not in condition to become the owner of the land, and then they took this land from the common people and gave it back to the favorites. That was the only cause of the despotism maintained by Diaz during the 30 years in which he carried on his military despotic autocracy.

"Comrades, a year and a half ago another revolution started, with the same old question, the lands for the common people. That was the only purpose of the revolution, and will be the only purpose of any revolution in Mexico. Mr. Madero, to-day's president of Mexico, came to the revolutionary movement at the last moment. . . . We, the old revolutionists, the pioneers of the revolution, know that Madero will be unwilling and unable to accomplish a solution of the question of the ownership of the lands by the common people. . . .

"Madero belongs to a very wealthy family of multi-millionaires. They own immense tracts of land in Mexico; and does anybody suppose that Mr. Madero and his . . . relatives are going graciously to give up their lands to the common people? They are not. So the revolution is now in a critical moment. . . .

"Comrades, the revolution is going to succeed. In the next two or three months there will be a beginning, at

least, in the division of the lands, and before the revolution is ended the division of the lands will be accomplished. After that . . . will come a government, elected, of course, by these small landowners, and this government will legalize this part of the revolution that has been accomplished. It is not a question of the government's dividing the land. The lands are going to be taken by the men themselves, and the government after that will legalize what has been done. That is the scheme; that is the plan of the revolution. . . .

"So the issue is very clear now. The division of the lands will be accomplished. The revolution will be successful, but there is the threat of the old times, the American Government doing everything possible to interfere in Mexico, with the only purpose to compel the Mexican workers to serve their masters and to protect the property of American citizens. They say that the intervention of the American Government will be only for the purpose of protecting American life and American property in Mexico, but it will be with the purpose of carrying on the issue so that it is well understood by the master class, and that issue is that the class-conscious master class in the United States feel the necessity of helping their brothers, the master class of Mexico."

II. PROCLAMATION ON THE MEXICAN SITUATION BY THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF AMERICA, APRIL 25, 1914

Again we are being lashed into war by those who profit from war.

Capitalist drums are beating, trumpets blaring, and forces recruiting.

All this that the nation may be goaded into war and the workers made to consent to shoot and be shot.

For centuries the resources of Mexico have lain dormant. Of late that country has been touched by the magic wand of capital-

ism and the same development is taking place there that always takes place when modern capitalism clashes with backward feudalism.

Ninety per cent of her population are still landless and propertyless. For hundreds of years the Mexican people have struggled against almost insurmountable difficulties to overthrow tyrants who have ruled and ruined them.

For hundreds of years the Mexican people have been in a state of continuous revolt because the great majority are in condition of peonage. Robbed of their land in an agricultural country, the change from the Spanish rule to an independent republic avails the Mexican people little or nothing. So long as peonage remains, revolt must follow revolt.

In vain did the Mexican people elevate Madero to the presidency. Their hope that he would recognize their need and restore the land to the people was not fulfilled. They are still fighting to win Mexico for the Mexicans.

In Sonora, Durango, and Chihuahua, where the revolutionists are in control, the people are taking possession of the land. Now, when the revolutionists believe that victory is in sight, the great American republic, controlled by sinister capitalist interests and without a declaration of war, lands an armed force on Mexican soil. No nation in modern times has ever begun hostilities upon a pretext so shallow as the flag incident at Tampico.

The war will inevitably unite all factions in Mexico against the invaders of their country. Their resistance to the forces of the United States must fail, yet it will cost thousands of lives through bullet, bayonet, and disease.

In order to subdue Mexico, the American army must march across that country like Sherman marched to the sea. Our army will leave behind a path of desolation, ruined homes, and death.

And finally, when American arms have triumphed, who will be the winners? The American people will not win. The Mexican people will not win. German, English, and American capitalists, backed up by our army, will exploit Mexico and the Mexican peon as capitalism always exploits the working-people everywhere.

Moreover, the effect of the war on our own country will be deplorable.

War strengthens every force hurtful to civilization, every force hurtful to labor. While war lasts there will be no social legisla-

tion. Enough money will be used up in dealing death to human beings to provide old-age pensions, accident, sickness, and unemployed insurance for every worker in America for a generation.

Every piratical power will seize this opportunity to prey upon our people. Exploiting capitalism will meet every attack by wrapping the American flag around its plunder.

Remember that the capitalist class in Colorado, destroying with machine guns American workers struggling for better conditions, is the very same class that seeks to rule Mexico.

The Socialist Party is opposed, as a matter of principle, to every war of aggression. We believe that there is but one justification for war, and that is to fight for freedom. Our freedom has not been assailed by the Mexicans. There is no reason why American workingmen should leave their homes and families to have their bodies mangled on Mexican battlefields.

In the name of two million American Socialists, in the name of thirty million Socialists throughout the world, in the name of humanity and civilization, we protest against the war with Mexico.

By the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party.

VICTOR BERGER,
ADOLPH GERMER,
GEO. H. GOEBEL,
JAMES H. MAURER,
J. STITT WILSON.

Attest: WALTER LANFERSIEK,
Executive Secretary.

I. THE ARGENTINE REPUBLIC

The Socialist Party was formed in 1896, but elected its first deputy, Alfredo Palacios, from Buenos Ayres, in 1904, with 1,257 votes. This number rose to 7,006 in 1910. In 1912 the suffrage laws were changed, Palacios was elected with 32,000 votes, and Dr. Juan Justo with 23,000 votes—also in Buenos Ayres. In 1914 the Socialists elected all seven candidates in that city—which, added to the above two, re-elected in 1913, when half the Chamber of Deputies was voted upon, gives a total of nine.

The election for the Chamber of Deputies shows that the Socialist vote ranged from 40,014 to 43,336 for the seven men the workers elected, with their Radical opponents polling only from 32,074 to 37,517, and the other two bourgeois parties trailing hopelessly in the rear.

The seven Socialists elected to the Chamber are Francisco Cuneo, Marlo Bravo, Nicolas Repetto, Enrique Dickmann, Antonio De Tomaso, Antonia Zaccagnini, Angel M. Jimenez.

All of these men are active workers for the Socialist cause, Dickmann being editor-in-chief of *La Vanguardia*, the big Socialist daily of this city, and De Tomaso national secretary of the Socialist Party.

In the election of 1913 the Socialists cast 48,024 votes for their highest candidate, but the total vote then was larger and the Socialists elected but four candidates.

The total membership of the Argentine Chamber is 120, and the reaction is in control in the provinces outside of Buenos Ayres.

Besides the 43,000 votes in the city of Buenos Ayres, the Socialists secured in 1914, 8,700 votes in the province of that name, 2,000 in Santa Fé, and 1,500 in other districts—a total of 55,000. The votes for the other parties in Buenos Ayres were: Radical, 37,000; Civic Party, 20,000; Constitutionalists, 13,000.

The following were the chief planks of the Socialist platform:

Abolition of the taxes that increase the cost of living, the application of progressive taxes upon land.

Limitation of the compulsory military service to three months.

Abolition of the law permitting the expulsion of foreigners without trial.

Laws providing for hygienic and safe conditions in factories and compensation for accidents.

Maximum working day of eight hours, and minimum wage of

seven shillings per day for all workers employed directly or indirectly by the state or municipalities.

Universal suffrage in municipal elections.

Separation of church and state; amendment of the divorce laws.

Abolition of the penalty of death.

II. THE ARGENTINE PARTY AND NATIONALISM

By W. Thiessen

The development of the Socialist Party in the Argentine Republic is described by W. Thiessen (of La Plata) in the *Neue Zeit*. Its origin is purely international, the party at first, some 25 years ago, being composed of three groups—a German group, called the *Vorwärts*; a French group, *Les Egaux*; and the Italian, *Fascio dei Lavoratori*.

The Spanish-speaking Argentine Socialists were only a small group at the commencement, but from 1894 onwards, when the paper, *La Vanguardia*, was started, have increased in numbers and now form the bulk of the party. This development is quite in accordance with the economic facts, Argentine industry, or, rather, industry in the Argentine, being almost entirely the result of the introduction of European capital and of European labor, both skilled and unskilled. Even now this is apparent at a glance at a business directory of Argentine towns, where Italian, German, and French names can be found in abundance.

As a party of foreign workmen, it could, of course, have no influence on the politics of the country, and only as the membership was drawn more and more from the Argentinos did the voting strength of the party increase. In 1903, of 884 paying members in the city of Buenos Ayres, 467 were Argentinos and 417 foreigners; in the provinces, the proportion was 373 Argentinos to 479 foreigners. At the present time the foreigners are still about 30 per cent of the membership. At the Congress held last

May in Rosario, the delegates represented organizations with a membership in Buenos Ayres city of 1,201 and in the provinces of 2,310.

In the National Congress the party has nine representatives, in the Senate one, in the Provincial Assembly of Buenos Ayres two, and in Mendoza one. . . .

While in 1903 half the party members were of foreign birth, in 1914 this was true only of one-third.

The party has still a hard task in front of it, as the industrial working-class, upon which it must rely in the main, is still largely cosmopolitan, the Italians predominating. In order to increase its membership in full citizens from that class, a rule of the party says that foreigners cannot become members of the party unless they get themselves naturalized, an exception being made only in the case of those workers to whom the authorities refuse naturalization, a not unusual occurrence.

At the elections other sections of the population have contributed largely to the success, such as state and municipal officials of the lower ranks, private employers, and a certain proportion of the smaller shopkeepers and tradesmen. Among these, as indeed is the case with all Argentinos, the nationalist feeling is very strong. One prominent Socialist and former Senator, Manuel Ugarte, who for some years represented Argentina on the International Socialist Bureau, seems to have gone over entirely to the Nationalist Patriotic Party, and devotes himself now to the advocacy of the idea of an *America latina*, a movement directed against the growing influence of the United States in the South American republics. Arising out of some article in *Vanguardia*, the party organ, which to him seemed to be derogatory of the dignity of the Latin races, as they described the backwardness of Central America, he commenced a campaign in the capitalist press against

the party, accused it of being anti-patriotic, etc., and finally challenged a Socialist deputy, Palacios, to fight a duel. Ugarte was thereupon expelled by his organization and is now no longer to be considered as a Socialist.

The *Vanguardia* had merely declared that the opening of the Panama Canal would bring a new life to Central America. Hereupon a furious nationalistic onslaught was unchained. It wholly dominated the electoral agitation of 1914, and the party was forced to take a definite stand on the question, Nationalism and Socialism. A part of the comrades then made considerable concessions to nationalism. Another part arose vigorously against it. These differences were the chief feature of the Party Congress in May (1914). No important decision was reached, however.

SECTION IV

SOCIALISM IN THE BRITISH EMPIRE

(Excluding Canada)

CHAPTER XVIII

THE BRITISH INDEPENDENT LABOR PARTY AND THE BRITISH SOCIALIST PARTY

I. INTRODUCTORY

1. THE BRITISH LABOR PARTY—EXCERPTS FROM CONSTITUTION

THE Socialist political movement in Great Britain finds its chief expression in the British Labor Party, which is primarily a federation of those trade-unions which stand for progressive labor legislation, with the Independent Labor Party, which is definitely committed to Socialism, and with the Fabian Society, an educational Socialist organization. The British Socialist Party, the third of the leading Socialist organizations in Great Britain, which, for many years, stood apart from this federation, applied for membership in May, 1914, as a result of the suggestion of a committee on unity, appointed by the International Socialist Congress.

The constitution of the party declares (1914) that its object is "To organize and maintain in Parliament and the country a political Labor Party," and provides that "Candidates and members must . . . appear before their constituencies under the title of labor candidates only; abstain strictly from identifying themselves with or promoting the interests of any other party; and accept the responsibilities established by parliamentary practice.

“Before a candidate can be regarded as adopted for a constituency, his candidature must be sanctioned by the national executive; and where at the time of a by-election no candidate has been so sanctioned, the national executive shall have power to withhold its sanction.”

The constitution further provides that “The national executive shall consist of 16 members, 11 representing the trade-unions, 1 the trades-councils, women’s organizations, and local labor parties, and 3 the Socialist societies, who shall be elected by ballot at the annual conference by their respective sections, and the treasurer, who shall also be elected by the conference.”

2. GROWTH OF THE BRITISH LABOR PARTY

In 1912 the membership of the Labor Party was estimated at 1,895,498. The trade-unions contributed the bulk of the membership—1,858,178. The Independent Labor Party and the Fabian Society contributed 31,237, of which the I. L. P. possessed nearly 30,000.

The executive committee of the Labor Party gave in 1913 the following estimate of growth:

	Trade-union membership	Socialist societies membership	Total
1900-1	353,070	22,861	375,931
1901-2	455,450	13,861	469,311
1902-3	847,315	13,835	861,150
1903-4	956,025	13,775	969,800
1904-5	855,270	14,730	900,000
1905-6	904,496	16,784	921,280
1906-7	975,182	20,885	998,338
1907	1,049,673	22,267	1,072,413
1908	1,127,035	27,465	1,158,565
1909	1,450,648	30,982	1,486,308
1910	1,394,402	31,377	1,430,539
1911	1,501,783	31,404	1,539,092
1912	1,858,178	31,237	1,895,498

The report of the Executive Committee for 1913 declares:

The Labor Party is . . . primarily a political organization controlled by the British labor unions. But [with the] affiliation of the British Socialist Party . . . there will be nearly 50,000 Socialist Party members, who are also members of the Labor Party. Though less than three per cent of the total membership, they have furnished [1913] 7 of the 40 Labor Party members of Parliament. . . .

II. THE INDEPENDENT LABOR PARTY (SOCIALIST)

1. PROGRAM

The true object of industry being the production of the requirements of life, the responsibility should rest with the community collectively, therefore:

The land being the storehouse of all the necessities of life should be declared and treated as public property.

The capital necessary for the industrial operations should be owned and used collectively.

Work, and wealth resulting therefrom, should be equitably distributed over the population.

As a means to this end we demand the enactment of the following measures:

1. A maximum of 48 hours working week, with the retention of all existing holidays, and Labor Day, May 1, secured by law.

2. The provision of work to all capable adult applicants at recognized trade-union rates, with a statutory minimum of 6d. per hour.

In order to remuneratively employ the applicants, parish, district, borough, and county councils to be invested with powers to:

- (a) Organize and undertake such industries as they may consider desirable;

- (b) Compulsorily acquire land; purchase, erect, or manufacture buildings, stock, or other articles for carrying on such industries;

- (c) Levy rates on the rental values of the district, and borrow money on the security of such rates for any of the above purposes.

3. State pensions for every person over 50 years of age, and

adequate provision for all widows, orphans, sick, and disabled workers.

4. Free, secular, moral, primary, secondary, and university education, with free maintenance while at school or university.

5. The raising of the age of child labor, with a view to its ultimate extinction.

6. Municipalization and public control of the drink traffic.

7. Municipalization and public control of all hospitals and infirmaries.

8. Abolition of indirect taxation and the gradual transference of all public burdens on to unearned incomes, with a view to their ultimate extinction.

9. The Independent Labor Party is in favor of adult suffrage, with full political rights and privileges for women, and the immediate extension of the franchise to women on the same terms as granted to men; also triennial Parliaments and second ballot.

2. ACTIVITIES OF THE I. L. P. MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT

The report to the Party Congress of 1914 dwells upon the Socialists' fight for woman suffrage and for a better finance bill, and their agitation against the increase of armament, the action of the Dublin police, the deportation of trade-union leaders, etc. The report deals with the manner in which present parliamentary procedure leads to ineffectiveness. It reads:

The relations of the I. L. P. members of the Labor Party with their trade-union colleagues continue cordial. The composite character of the Labor Party and the differences of political training and economic views to be found among the members of the Labor Party should be kept in mind.

So long as the House of Lords exists in its present form, with power to suspend legislative measures for a period of two years or more, necessitating such measures being passed by the House of Commons in at least three successive sessions, there will be a great deal of time wasted which might otherwise be devoted to new measures, and there will be a natural disposition not to throw away the advantage which has been won by stages

already passed on the road to the final enactment of measures. The Parliament Act, while restricting the powers of the House of Lords, has created new difficulties for the House of Commons, and the present situation is one which cannot be permanently endured. . . .

It is not likely that the Government will endeavor to pass a comprehensive reform bill in this Parliament, but should they do so, we shall do all we can to secure the enfranchisement of women in it on a comprehensive basis, or failing that we shall oppose the further extension of the male franchise. The position of the Woman Suffrage question, though for the moment parliamentary interest in it is quiet, is hopeful. If nothing is done further in this Parliament it will be necessary to make this a prominent issue at the next general election, so that the Government will not be able to make the excuse that there is no popular mandate for the reform.

The Labor Party has been extremely active during the present session. It has raised debates of first-class importance on the action of the Dublin police and the deportation of the South African trade-union leaders, accidents in mines and on railways, the condition of the blind, and other matters. Neither in regard to Dublin nor South Africa was any satisfaction obtained from the Government, but promises of legislation or inquiry were made in regard to the other matters.

The Government's extravagance in naval affairs continues, and this year the Admiralty have presented navy estimates of over £50,000,000. The I. L. P. members have offered a united and strong opposition to this expenditure. The opposition to this criminal extravagance was left mainly to the Labor Party. The Radicals seem to have forsaken all the principles of economy in which they have been trained. We shall continue to oppose this expenditure on armaments, not only because of the waste of national wealth which is involved, but in the interests of international goodwill.

A vast amount of very useful work has been done by the I. L. P. members in quiet and unobtrusive ways, on commissions and committees, and in attending to complaints about the administration of laws.

We do not submit to you this short and incomplete report of the work of the past year with a feeling of complete satisfaction with our achievements. On the contrary we are very

fully aware of how small and inadequate it is compared with what we should like to see accomplished. We are hampered by the special circumstances of the parliamentary situation, and by the smallness of our numbers; and as I. L. P. members, whose aim is to advance the cause of Socialism, by the variety of economic thought and political sympathy in the Labor Party. We recognize the advantages of labor generally by such a combination of Trade-Unionists and Socialists as we have in the Labor Party, but we have never been blind to the fact that if we, as Socialists, are to get the benefit of the support of our trade-union allies it must involve some sacrifice of our own independent action as an I. L. P. We are constantly having to consider cases where the opinions of the Labor Party and the I. L. P., as expressed by the resolutions of the two conferences, differ or conflict.

Occasionally loyalty to the Labor Party alliance involves the sacrifice of I. L. P. resolutions. This difference sometimes, as in the case of the Plural Voting Bill and the Insurance Bill, leads to divisions among ourselves. This is a difficult situation, and one which is perhaps inherent in the present stage of the development of a parliamentary labor party, but it would be well if the Conference at its special sitting to discuss parliamentary policy would give some attention to this matter.

J. R. CLYNES,
J. KEIR HARDIE,
F. W. JOWETT,
J. RAMSAY MACDONALD,
JAMES PARKER,
THOS. RICHARDSON,
PHILIP SNOWDEN.

3. CRITICISM AND DEFENSE OF THE LABOR PARTY BY THE I. L. P. PARTY CONFERENCE, 1914

The chief criticism in the Party Conference of 1914 centered around the rumored alliance between the Labor Party and the Liberal Party. In the British Parliament, if the House of Lords vetoes a bill, this bill must be passed three times in succession by the House of Commons before it becomes a law. If the Government Party—in recent

years, the Liberal Party—should be defeated in any measures proposed by it, the Cabinet usually resigns and another election is called. If the Government Party is ousted before the bill is passed the third time, the bill must go again through the same course. The three most important bills before Parliament, prior to this conference, supported by the Liberal and Labor parties and vetoed by the House of Lords, were the Home Rule Bill, the Plural Voting Bill (which purports to make it impossible for any man to vote more than once), and the Welsh Disestablishment Bill. It was often necessary for the Labor Party to support the Liberal Party in its proposed measures if it desired to retain the Government in power and thus to save the three foregoing bills. This support, among other things, led to rumors of an alliance.

Robert Smillie, president of the Miners' Federation, declared in the Conference that he would rather have a parliamentary party of 7 which refused to enter an alliance than one with 40 which joined hands with the Liberals; that if such a calamity as an alliance occurred, neither he nor the miners' organization would be any party to it, even though the party conceded, as an inducement, the installment of satisfactory life-saving apparatus in the mines or the fixing of a minimum wage by law.

Philip Snowden, M. P., said that whether or not there was any alliance, understanding, or agreement with the Liberal Party, the policy of the Labor Party was in very little sense different from that which it would have been if there had been an open and acknowledged alliance. Whenever a resolution tabled for introduction to the House was discussed by the Parliamentary Party, he stated, it was minutely scrutinized to see whether it could possibly be supported by the Tories and thus endanger the existence of the Government.

When Mr. Hardie was chairman of the Labor group he had said he would not go cap in hand to the Government; the Labor Party room was number 40, and if the Government whips wanted him, he was there. That, Mr. Snowden declared, was the only self-respecting attitude to adopt.

He had not lost faith in the Labor Party, he said, but it had to face, as alternatives, either subservience to a capitalist government or independence. As for him, he believed that a small party of six, if determined, class-conscious, and self-conscious, would be worth the whole of the present party.

J. Ramsay Macdonald, M. P., chairman of the Labor Party, defended the position taken by the parliamentary group. He declared that there was no such thing as an alliance with the Liberals; that there had not even been any discussion of such an alliance, and as far as he was concerned, no approach to an agreement had been made between the Labor Party and the Liberal Party which meant the change by one hair-breadth of the policy of the Labor Party. There had been talks between individual members, perhaps, but no official consultations.

It was not a question of agreements, he declared, but the Labor Party was bound to take into consideration whether it was going to undo by its electoral policy what it had asked the Labor members to do during the life of the present Parliament.

4. RESOLUTION AGAINST THE BRITISH SYSTEM OF PARTY LEGISLATION

W. Leach, of Bradford, introduced the following resolution, urging the parliamentary group to disregard certain of the so-called exigencies of parliamentary rule:

That cabinet rule, which involves the suppression of the rights of the private member to any adequate voice in the policy of his party, and which implies the resignation of the Ministry and the dissolution of Parliament when proposals of the cabinet are negatived, besides making almost impossible the free consideration of proposals which have not received the cabinet hall-mark, is inimical to the good government of the country; that with a view to the ultimate break-up of this system, the Parliamentary Labor Party be asked to take no account of any such considerations and to vote on all issues only in accordance with the principles for which the party stands.

Speech by F. W. Jowett, M. P. (the new chairman of the I. L. P.)

F. W. Jowett, M. P. (Bradford), supporting the resolution, pointed out that the Radical Party had once been told that if they did not accept the estimates they could not destroy the veto of the House of Lords; and that the Irish Party had been told that if they did not accept them the Government would be turned out of office and they would not get Home Rule; the Welsh Party had been told that if they did not vote for the Government they would not get Welsh Disestablishment; and the Labor Party had been told they would not get the Osborne Bill or insurance against unemployment if they failed to support the Government. He continued:

If the Labor Party [he added] were in the position of the Irish Party with one outstanding measure, caring nothing for the general ruck of legislation and intent on one measure alone, they could say to the Government, "We hold 39 votes. Give us this measure and we will keep you in power: we will keep you in even if by doing so we have to give a vote against 21 shillings a week for railwaymen."

Of course we cannot do it. We cannot carry out such a contract, and consequently that system of bargaining openly is not possible to the Labor Party. The Bradford resolution did not

merely suggest ignoring a bad system, but it called for the application of common honesty to public government. The present system would be absolutely punctured if any large body of the members of the House of Commons determined to vote on the merits of bills that were introduced, to treat of questions as questions of conscience and to vote accordingly.

Let me say here, I don't want a cabinet system under even labor domination. I have no wish to see ministerial control applied to any department of state even if the minister be a Socialist—because it means bureaucracy; because it means the people are not having control. . . . Even if it were a labor government I should regard a government of ministers, each with sole control of a public department, as exceedingly bad for the public. . . . Certainly we will not go so far as to say we will cover up the iniquities of a government with which we do not agree in other matters in order to get the things we desire. The history of the past few years shows that there have been votes which it is exceedingly difficult for us to defend. Those votes would not have been given had it not been for the fact that we were doing this for the deliberate purpose of keeping the Government in office in order that they might pass home rule or some other measure. . . .

Are we to be deprived of the right to register a solemn censure on one question because of a bigger question for which the Government stands? If so, in my judgment neither in your day nor in mine shall we be free of some great political question which will keep us bond-slaves. I for one refuse to be a bond-slave. I will be free.

The resolution was carried by a vote of 233 to 78.

III. THE BRITISH SOCIALIST PARTY

The British Socialist Party was formed at the end of 1911, from the amalgamation of the Social Democratic Party (founded in 1884) and several other Socialist organizations.

The following resolution was carried unanimously at the Unity Conference at Manchester on September 30, 1911:

"This conference of Socialist organizations, believing that the difference of opinion and the adoption of dissimilar tactics, which have hitherto characterized the various sections of the British Socialist movement, have arisen from circumstances peculiar to its initial stages, is convinced that the time is now ripe for the formation of a United Socialist Party, and the delegates pledge their organizations to co-operate in the unification of their forces on the following basis of common agreement:

"The Socialist Party is the political expression of the working-class movement, acting in the closest co-operation with industrial organizations for the socialization of the means of production and distribution—that is to say, the transformation of capitalist society into a collectivist or communist society. Alike in its objects, its ideals, and in the means employed, the Socialist Party is not a reformist but a revolutionary party, which recognizes that social freedom and equality can only be won by fighting the class war through to the finish, and thus abolishing for ever all class distinctions."

CHAPTER XIX

THE BRITISH LABOR PARTY

I. THE BRITISH LABOR PARTY IN PARLIAMENT, 1912

AT the Party Conference in 1913, the Labor Party submitted its parliamentary report, describing the order in which the group in Parliament decided to submit its bills, and its continued ill fortune in securing an acceptable place in the balloting. It also dealt with the activity of the group in the coal and Port of London strikes, and in connection with the home rule, Welsh disestablishment, franchise, trade-union, railway, education, and other measures.

The report reads in part as follows:

It was decided the following bills should be balloted for in the order given: Trade-Union Law Amendment; Right to Work; Education (Administrative Provisions); Eight Hours' Day; Railway Nationalization; Compulsory Weighing; Eviction of Workmen during Trade Disputes; Blind Aid; and Local Authorities (Enabling).

The party's ill fortune in the ballot in previous sessions was continued in this. . . . The Trade-Union Law Amendment, Right to Work, and Education (Administrative Provisions) bills were reintroduced, but made no progress. The short bill to legalize the feeding of school children during holidays, introduced last session, was again brought forward, but although the Government declared their agreement with it, no time was allotted to secure its passage. . . .

The Coal Strike and the Coal Mines (Minimum Wage) Bill

A very important part of the party's work during the session was in connection with the national strike of miners. Throughout

the dispute the party was in close touch with the Miners' Federation and carried out all the wishes of the Federation to the best of its ability. In order to settle the strike the Government brought forward a bill to establish a minimum wage for miners, but no precise figures were set forth. The party therefore moved an amendment fixing the minimum at five shillings a day for adults other than piece-workers, and two shillings a day for boys. The Government refused to accept this proposal and it was rejected. Other amendments were moved with a view to improving the bill, and some were carried. In consequence of the defeat of the five shillings and two shillings amendment, however, the miners in conference advised opposition to the third reading of the bill and the party acted accordingly.

The Port of London Strike and the Industrial Agreements Bill

This dispute also played an important part in the work of the session, and it is a matter for regret that the result was unsatisfactory. The party did all it could to help the men, and during the latter part of the dispute had a representative on the strike committee. The strike was really due to certain employers in the port not observing agreements come to between representatives of the employers and employed. In consultation with the Transport Workers' Federation, the party put forward a proposal that where an agreement had been come to between representatives of employers and employed it should be made legally binding on the whole of the trade in the district, and a bill on these lines applying to the Port of London only was subsequently introduced. It should be clearly understood that the sole object of the bill was to enforce an existing voluntary agreement on any section in the district that was unorganized and unrepresented at the conference where such agreement was come to. The agreement would presumably be for a certain term, and the workmen would not or need not accept any agreement which would render them powerless in the event of a new situation arising. Therefore, the right to strike was in no way infringed except in so far as an agreement voluntarily come to might specify. The bill made no progress. . . .

Government of Ireland Bill and Established Church (Wales) Bill

The session has been mainly taken up with fulfilling pledges given in respect to three big political measures, two of which

were the Home Rule and Welsh Disestablishment Bills. In respect to these the party generally had made most definite promises to the constituencies and it did its best to get the measures carried and put out of the way.

Franchise and Registration Bill

. . . The party has amendments down to secure full adult suffrage, a three months' qualification, and the repeal of the pauper disqualification. . . .

Trade-Unions Bill

From the party's special point of view the chief bill of the session was the Trade-Unions (No. 2) Bill. This bill did not seek to reverse the Osborne Judgment, but it gave the unions power to add political objects to their rules, provided that a majority of the members by ballot had so decided. It also gave to members who objected to pay to the Parliamentary Fund the right to withhold payment altogether. . . . The party exerted every effort to improve the bill and to secure its passage . . . should it be acceptable to the movement. [A special national conference of delegates was called to consider the matter.]

Railways Bill

In pursuance of a promise given by the Government to the railway companies at the time of the railway strike, a bill was introduced empowering the companies to increase their rates and charges to an extent sufficient to cover any extra cost entailed by the improved conditions of service of the employees. The bill as it was worded threw the onus of proof on any aggrieved person that an increased rate or charge was [excessive], and there were other objectionable proposals. . . . The bill was subsequently withdrawn. Another bill [was] substituted and it provides that it shall lie with the company to prove that any proposed increase is justifiable. . . . But the party has decided to oppose it on the ground that the railway companies have largely recouped themselves for any concessions they may have given to their employees. In addition the party is opposed to giving further powers to monopolies because trade-union action has resulted in securing improved conditions of service for the employees.

Education

At the Birmingham Conference a resolution was carried requesting the party to appoint a committee to consider the general question of educational reform and draw up a report thereon. The committee was to consider

(1) A modification of the curriculum in primary schools, in order that in the later years of school life more time may be given to instruction in the duties of citizenship;

(2) The raising of the school-leaving age to 16 years, and the right of children in primary and secondary schools to maintenance allowances;

(3) The limiting of the hours of boy and girl labor up to the age of 18 to 30 per week, so as to provide 20 or more hours per week for physical, technological, and general training;

(4) The establishment of medical treatment centers in connection with each primary school or group of schools.

Policy and Propaganda

The party has considered the political situation and its bearing upon parliamentary action and energetic propagandist efforts throughout the country in the immediate future. Committees have been appointed to consider the drafting and introduction of bills dealing with the nationalization of mines and railways, the problem of poverty on the lines of the recommendation of the minority report of the Poor Law Commission, the abolition of sweating by the development of the Trade Boards Act, extensive housing reform, a further application of the taxation of unearned incomes, the compulsory feeding and medical treatment of school children throughout the year, and a general reduction in the hours of labor.

A committee is considering the problem of rural housing, the importance and practicability of fixing a minimum wage for agricultural laborers, the extension of small holdings, the putting of land to its best use, and the questions of taxation and public ownership. In order that the inquiry may be full and complete the committee is taking evidence and examining schemes in the hope that the pro-

posals in its report may be practical and comprehensive.

The group also opposed an investigation into the causes of industrial unrest, on the ground that these causes are already known. It urged legislation securing the right to work, unemployment insurance, a maximum eight-hours' working day, a minimum wage, and the nationalization of the railways, mines, land, and other monopolies, to remedy the situation.

II. PARTY CONFERENCE OF 1913

Chairman Roberts dealt, in his address, with a number of the salient issues before the party, including the value of political vs. direct action, and the desirability of legislation dealing with the franchise for men and women, with housing, the condition of the agricultural worker, and railroad nationalization. His speech, in part, was as follows:

Recently we have witnessed a recrudescence of the allegation that political action is futile and direct industrialism the only certain means of realizing working-class aims and aspirations. The Labor Party challenges that view with the assertion that both means are necessary. None can avoid a sense of disappointment at the results of political action. And is it not equally so with the strike policy? The truth is that while the highest expectations formed of either are unfulfilled, yet considerable advantage has accrued from both. In either case the comparative failure is identical. . . . Given a more thorough education and organization of the workers, their political and industrial activities would be correspondingly the more productive. . . .

Direct actionists affect to repudiate the representative government of modern democracy, and have aroused the suspicion that they favor violence rather than discussion and reason. My submission is that politics cannot be dispensed with, and that the perfect state will only come through well-ordered effort and schemes, and not through a purely economic outburst. Let it be remembered that the state is as yet imperfectly democratized.

Our object is to make the state synonymous with the people. When a popular franchise is attained, the people by political organization can master the state and use it for popular purposes. . . . When industries are brought under public control political methods will be necessary to determine principles of administration. Again, the attainments of force can only subsist by the sanction of force. If Parliament is vacated by labor the control by opponents of public revenue, the naval, military, and civil forces would speedily encompass the downfall of the new system. Neither is it wise to stake everything on a single policy of forceful action. This is a reckless gamble. Moreover, do not direct actionists minimize the resisting power of employers and possessors? Simultaneously with the cessation of labor occurs a cruel aggravation of the hardship and suffering of women and children—a risk which cannot be lightly encountered.

. . . While heartily welcoming the movement towards less unions and more unity, together with the closer federation of workers, there is need to emphasize the point that salvation evolves from the use of both arms—the industrial and the political. . . .

An example substantiating the foregoing is found in the miners' strike of last year. Having exhausted every conciliatory and negotiatory means without avail, no alternative remained to the Miners' Federation but to call upon their members to "down tools." This soon paralyzed industry and transit. The owners were implacable and unyielding. Confronted by this crisis the Government was compelled to seek a solution. Its intervention took the form of a Minimum Wage Bill. Throughout, the Parliamentary Party had kept in contact with the Miners' Federation. Immediately legislation was contemplated they placed themselves unreservedly at the disposal of the miners. That valuable aid was rendered in fashioning this measure is gratefully acknowledged by the miners. With all its shortcomings and disappointments the act bears eloquent testimony to the worth of political representation. . . .

In the succeeding Transport Workers' strike the influence of the party unquestionably frustrated the full use of armed and civil powers being placed as heretofore on the side of the employers and in the protection of blacklegs. Further, as the strike was traceable to the refusal of certain firms to conform to agreements entered into between the several unions and employer's

representatives the party, in conjunction with the men's leaders, gave careful consideration to that point. As a result a bill was introduced to give legal sanction to agreements voluntarily made between bodies appropriately representative of employers and organized workmen. The proposal in no way conflicts with the right to strike. It would simply make obligatory on all employers in a given industry the conditions negotiated by customary trade-union practice. . . . Admittedly some apprehension exists respecting the operations of such a measure. . . . Extreme care must be exercised in making agreements, and nothing be accepted that vitiates the principles or freedom of trade-unions. Having secured this, no danger arises in compelling workmen and employers alike to conform thereto. . . .

Acknowledging as I do that contractual obligations should be honored, and that only in the case of great provocation should agreements be broken, I nevertheless view with grave misgiving the prominence accorded compulsory arbitration. This device would assuredly prove disastrous to effective industrial activity. The swift and mobile disposition of forces is a strategic necessity in labor struggles as in actual warfare. Delays imposed by arbitral proceedings might seriously jeopardize the prospects of victory. Constituted as the state is at present, restrictions of this character must be resisted, for it is difficult to conceive a tribunal that would merit our whole-hearted confidence. . . . Believing that the strike . . . will increase in efficiency as more workers pay into unions, I would jealously preserve all existing faculties. . . . The right to relinquish work is the heritage of every free worker. . . .

To win back for trade-unions the right of political action has constituted the chief duty of the session. That a complete reversal of judge-made law is not yet attained is regretted, and must still be pursued. . . . Comprehensive political work can be undertaken, and appeal must be made to those invested with exemption thereunder to recognize that as political action is a necessary form of trade-union equipment, none should shirk their responsibilities, especially as none would deny the benefits gained. . . .

Whilst regretting the abandonment of the Franchise and Registration Bill, we must now prepare for the future. That it has been proposed to base the right to vote on a simple residential qualification; to abolish the anomalies of plural voting and

university representation; to aim at continuous registration, accompanied by a general systematization and simplification of electoral machinery, is commendable. . . . The Conference should decide on the principles it favors for insuring that while majorities shall rule, minorities get due representation. . . . The second ballot is now discarded for the alternative vote. This contemplates a system of universal single-numbered constituencies, whereunder voters would be required to declare a second preference to take effect in the event of their first choice being unsuccessful. Whilst this would secure that a majority in a constituency would win the seat, it affords no guarantee that the smaller parties would get fair representation. . . .

The question of women's enfranchisement is unfortunately still undecided. The labor movement has consistently urged that all adult persons, regardless of sex, should enjoy the full rights of citizenship. In accord therewith the party strives to secure the enfranchisement of women on the same terms as now suggested for men, that is, for adult suffrage. . . .

Every Socialist and Laborist will agree that adequate remuneration is the title of every worker. If an industry does not yield that it is parasitic in character, its deficiencies having to be borne, in various forms, by other industries. Thus we insist that the agricultural laborer, with all other workers, shall have a reward equal to meeting the whole necessities of life. Placing this obligation upon agriculture will, it is believed, compel cultivators to adopt more scientific methods, whereby the productivity of land can be enormously increased.

No less urgent is the question of housing. The agricultural laborer is frequently tied to a house as a condition of employment. From this he must be released, as it fetters his action and restricts his liberty. There is no hope that this problem can be dealt with without state aid. Private enterprise has particularly failed in rural parts. True, this proposal of state assistance cuts athwart the preconceived economic notions of some, who see in it nothing but a subsidy to employers and landlords. These overlook the moral factor. Give the rural worker a reasonable wage, with a free home in place of the tied-house, then he acquires a sense of manliness and freedom which eminently fits him for progressive developments. The experiment of the Irish Laborers' Acts, under which some 42,600 houses have been built by state aid, gives confirmation to this theory.

Were all sections of labor to unite, definite steps in the direction of public ownership could be taken. Railway nationalization, for instance, is a practicable proposition. With the pooling of interests, and the amalgamation of rival companies, great administrative economies are being effected and a huge trust being created. Labor is speeded up, its status reduced, prospects of promotion decreased, and the railwayman tends to become chained to a subsistence level. Trade and commerce are in the grip of a great menace, being unable to contemplate either lowered rates or enhanced facilities. Transit is a public necessity which should not be privately exploited. Last year the telephone service was transferred from company to public ownership, with scarcely a ripple disturbing the country. A similar transference of railways could be as orderly and easily accomplished. . . .

The manner in which consumers suffer in the prices of coal make it desirable that the same principle be applied to mines and coal supply. . . . A demand for land stimulated by a Small Holdings Act causes an unwarranted rise in price. The only effective remedy is to enable public authorities to acquire land on the basis of public valuation. Whilst holding the time opportune for the acquisition of rural lands, I would, as a temporary expedient, place higher taxation on urban values. This does not imply acceptance of the single tax theory. The only defensible single tax is that of graduated income tax, for here is assuredly reflected a person's ability to pay. Yet one exclusive form of taxation is not expedient. Other considerations enter, such as the moral desirability of limiting consumption in the case of intoxicating liquors, and with land taxation the forcing of land into use. Unearned increment exists in all forms of swollen wealth. Wherever found, these social values should more and more be diverted to social utility.

.

III. THE LABOR PARTY IN PARLIAMENT, 1914

Very much the same measures were discussed in the report before the 1914 Labor Conference as in that of 1913. The question of education receives extensive treatment. The report in part is as follows:

Bills

It was decided that the party should ballot for the Right to Work Bill, but unfortunately not a single member secured a place that would give this bill an opportunity of a second reading debate.

The following bills were introduced officially during the session :

Agricultural Laborers (Wages and Hours).

Education (Administrative Provisions).

Education (Provision of Meals).

Labor (Minimum Conditions).

Nationalization of Coal Mines and Minerals.

Prevention of Unemployment,

and others were introduced by members of the party.

None of the bills made any progress. . . .

King's Speech

The king's speech, . . . in referring to the estimates for the year, stated that they could be recommended for favorable consideration with the more confidence in view of the sustained prosperity which . . . the people continued to enjoy.

The party thereupon moved the following amendment :

"But humbly regret, having regard to the existing industrial and social conditions of large masses of the people arising from a deplorable insufficiency of wages, which has persisted notwithstanding the sustained prosperity as reflected in the statistics of trade and employment and a great expansion of national wealth, conditions which have been aggravated by a considerable increase in the cost of living, that your Majesty's gracious speech contains no specific mention of legislation securing a minimum living wage and for preventing a continuance of such unequal division of the fruits of industry by the nationalization of land, railways, mines, and other monopolies."

The Government's reply to this was that a bill would be introduced extending the Trade Boards Act to the trades of shirt-making, linen embroidery, sheet steel, and iron hollow-ware, and sugar confectionery and fruit-preserving. This was as far as the Government would commit itself, and in the division on the amendment 41 voted for and 199 against. The majority was composed of both Liberals and Tories.

Motions

The party was almost as unsuccessful in the ballots for motions as in that for bills, only one evening being secured. The motion moved was as follows:

"That the right of every family in the country to an income sufficient to enable it to maintain its members in decency and comfort should be recognized; and this House is therefore of opinion that the Trade Boards Act should be so extended as to provide for the establishment of a minimum wage of at least 30 shillings per week for every adult worker in urban areas and a minimum wage that will secure an approximately equal standard of life for every adult worker in rural areas; and this House also declares that the Government should set an example by adopting the minimum of 30 shillings per week in its own workshops and insert it as a condition in all contracts."

The motion was "talked out" and no division on it was possible, but the frequent presentation by the party of the case for a living wage is making it more and more a practical issue.

Finance

The cost of living and the burden of taxation on the working-classes were again raised on the second reading of the Finance Bill, the party moving the following amendment:

"That this House declines to assent to the second reading of a bill which continues the system of taxing the food of the people, whereby the unfair proportion of taxation imposed upon the poorer classes is aggravated, instead of abolishing such injurious and indefensible forms of taxation and raising the necessary revenue by increasing the direct taxes on unearned incomes and large estates."

.

Government of Ireland and Established Church (Wales) Bills

These bills were again put through their stages in the Commons, and on being sent to the Lords were rejected a second time. The bills are important in themselves, but a point of the very greatest weight for the party is that they are now under the Parliament Act, and their final passing becomes a matter of special importance. The party thought the Parliament Act cum-

bersome (as indeed it has been proved to be), but the authority of the elected House ought to be maintained in the teeth of the strenuous opposition which vested interests are offering to it. The bills will have to be passed through the Commons again next session and will then become law in spite of the Lords and irrespective of their opinion.

Plural Voting Bill

The Government introduced and passed through the Commons a small bill to abolish plural voting at general elections. The weakness of the bill is that it does not apply to by-elections, but the reason given by the Government for the narrow scope of the bill was that a measure to deal completely with the question would require more time than could be found in the already congested session. This view the party did not indorse, and it protested against it during the debate on the second reading. However, the bill was rejected by the Lords and, like Home Rule and Welsh Disestablishment, is now going through the stages of the Parliament Act.

Education

In pursuance of a resolution carried at the Birmingham Conference, a committee of the party has drawn up a Memorandum on Education. The resolution was as follows:

“In view of the fact that the education of the mass of working-class children to-day begins and ends at the elementary school, this conference is of opinion that there is urgent need for a generous measure of educational reform in the direction of providing facilities for liberal, as distinct from technical, education, thus laying the basis of the national life in an educated democracy. This conference therefore directs the party in Parliament to appoint a small committee to consider the general question of educational reform and draw up a report thereon. In this connection, the committee appointed is specially directed to consider:

“(1) A modification of the curriculum in primary schools, in order that in the later years of school life more time may be given to instruction in the duties of citizenship;

“(2) The raising of the school-leaving age to 16 years, and the right of children in primary and secondary schools to maintenance allowances;

"(3) The limiting of the hours of boy and girl labor up to the age of 18 to 30 per week, so as to provide 20 or more hours per week for physical, technological, and general training;

"(4) The establishment of medical treatment centers in connection with each primary school or groups of schools.

"Further, this conference urges the party to press the Government to appoint a royal commission to consider the matter of university endowments, with a view to their adaptation to the educational requirements of the people."

The report, prepared and presented by the education committee, was adopted by the party as a whole, and is as follows:

It is impossible within the limits of a report of this character to do anything more than indicate the general lines along which it appears most desirable the educational policy of labor should be developed. The matters to be dealt with may be conveniently divided under three heads:

- (1) Those concerning elementary education;
- (2) Those concerning continued and secondary education;
- (3) Those concerning university education.

(1) The matters relating to elementary education which appear to be of special importance and most urgent in character are:

(a) The raising of the school age. The reports of the Poor Law Commission, the Committee on Partial Exemption, and the Consultative Committee of the Board of Education, as well as previous decisions of the Conference render it unnecessary to advance arguments for the raising of the school age. The only question is how this can be done with least disturbance of existing arrangements. The best course would appear to be to secure legislative enactment for the immediate abolition of partial exemption and at the same time determine in advance the dates at which the age of full-time attendance is to be further raised in the future.

(b) An extension of the powers of local education authorities in the matter of regulating the employment of children and of street trading generally. It is recommended that local authorities should be empowered to make regulations with regard to the employment of children in *any* occupation, and to place the licensing of street traders in the hands of education authorities.

(c) The development of medical inspection and treatment, so

as to include the provision of school clinics, school baths, open-air schools, and an extension of the provision of meals for school children. For this purpose the present inadequate grants from the Board of Education should be considerably increased.

(2) (a) *Continued Education*.—At whatever age full-time attendance ceases, it will still be necessary to provide continued education for the vast majority who do not pass to a secondary school. A system of compulsory half-time attendance at a continuation school is required after the age of exemption from full-time attendance has been reached. This compulsory attendance at continuation classes, however, is out of the question unless the hours of labor are reduced.

(b) *Secondary Education*.—At present the passage of children from elementary to secondary schools is hindered by a variety of causes:

(i) Because in some districts only those children are likely to win scholarships from the elementary school who have been prepared for the scholarship examination.

(ii) Children who win scholarships are constantly prevented from accepting them by the poverty of their parents.

(iii) The rule as to the provision of 25 per cent of free places in secondary schools for children from elementary schools is sometimes evaded.

The only satisfactory method of dealing with these difficulties is a gradual extension of the system of providing free places in secondary schools until they are entirely free and maintenance grants made available in cases of necessity.

(3) *Universities*.—What is specially required in connection with the older universities is:

(a) A reform in the constitutions of the governing bodies which would place popularly elected representatives of the public upon them.

(b) A reduction in the cost of living in colleges, and a change in the award of scholarships so that only those students who require financial assistance may receive advantage from endowments expended in monetary grants.

(c) The extension of the non-collegiate systems in order to facilitate the entrance into Oxford and Cambridge of men who do not desire to reside in college.

In accordance with the resolution of Conference, a deputation from the party has waited upon the prime minister to urge the

appointment of a royal commission to inquire into the administration and finances of the universities of Oxford and Cambridge. Notwithstanding the fact that the demand of the deputation was not acceded to, it is recommended that the party continue to press for an inquiry and also that its scope should be enlarged to include inquiry into the administration and finances of the endowed public schools.

National Insurance Act Amendment Bill

The party took a very active part in the consideration of this bill to amend some of the provisions of the National Insurance Act. It contained 11 clauses when introduced, and provided additional money being granted from the treasury, the repeal of the provision for reduced benefits for those over 50 years of age, and one or two other matters.

Conclusion

The Labor Party left important marks on both the Insurance Bill and the Trade Boards Bill. It has once more drawn attention to the unsatisfactory condition of the Factory Department, to the burden of armaments, and many other details of wrong suffered by the common people, many of which it has succeeded in remedying. Its vigilance in connection with private bills—like Railway and Harbor Bills—has produced excellent results. . . .

IV. CONFERENCE OF 1914

Party tactics was also a feature of this conference. Several members contended that the parliamentary labor group had not shown proper militancy, while others protested that it was far more militant than the majority of its trade-union constituency.

The official report of the discussion was, in part, as follows:

Mr. W. C. Anderson [Independent Labor Party] said he was glad that an opportunity had been given for what he hoped would be a quite frank and friendly discussion of labor policy. . . . He

knew the feeling among a large number of members—not only I. L. P. members—was that the policy of the party in the House of Commons was not sufficiently distinctive from the policy of other parties in the House. Recently in Liberal, Tory, and Nationalist newspapers the Labor Party had been referred to as part of the coalition in the House of Commons, and the word was not used in the sense that the party had betrayed its independence. The idea was that those questions before Parliament which loomed large in the minds of Liberals and Nationalists were also the questions that loomed large in the mind of the Parliamentary Labor Party. Many people felt that the only thing that could justify the existence of a Labor Party separate from the other political parties was an unwearied championship of working-class questions. In the last two or three years the workers' battle had been more strongly fought by industrial methods outside than by political methods inside the House of Commons, and he thought there ought to be a reflection in the House of Commons of the heat and passionate indignation that had moved large masses of work-people to revolt. If that was not done the party was not going to win over the large mass of trade-unionists who, as revealed by recent ballots, were indifferent or hostile to the party. They had not convinced the average trade-unionist that in his battles he ought to look to the Labor Party to do his political work just as he looked to his union to do his industrial work. It was sometimes said that the party was not so free to fight because Home Rule or something else was in the way. He was as anxious to see Home Rule passed as anyone, but he felt that those directly concerned about Home Rule had a responsibility towards labor just as labor had a responsibility towards Home Rule, and the sacrifice ought not to be all on one side. . . . The party might give in too much to parliamentary exigencies and parliamentary expediences. . . .

Mr. W. S. Sanders [Fabian Society] said that . . . the party had to convince not only the other members in the House of Commons by their quiet work, but convince the country outside by a strong and, if necessary, dramatic work that the party was a necessary and permanent institution. He wished to give one or two concrete instances. They would all remember how gratified they were with the first two years' work of the Labor Party. All the papers in the country, Tory and Liberal as well as Labor, said truly that the great Liberal Party, on three measures, had

had to do what the Labor Party wanted. In a word, it was the Labor Party justifying itself as the new pioneer in legislation. Why did they do that? Because their victories were forced openly from the Liberal Government. . . . They had got to get back to the old position of fighting in public and forcing things from the Government, otherwise they would be looked upon as a mere body of people who followed in the wake of Mr. Lloyd George instead of making Lloyd George follow them.

Mr. Tom Shaw [United Textile Factory Workers] pointed out that the party consisted roughly of two millions of members, less than 35,000 of whom were avowed Socialists or, at any rate, organized Socialists. In the minds of those 35,000 people the policy of the party was not militant enough, but was there any Socialist present who believed that the policy was not militant enough for the remaining 1,900,000 members? If it was admitted that the policy was as militant as those 1,900,000 members desire, what was meant by the statement that the rank and file were disaffected? He knew something of the mind of the rank and file, and he knew that so far as the rank and file of his acquaintance went their opinion was that the policy was too militant.

1. RESOLUTION ON SOCIALISM

(Conference of 1914)

J. Bruce Glasier, of the I. L. P., introduced a resolution at this conference which practically indorsed the Socialist program of collective ownership. The resolution was carried. The report of the conference is, in part, as follows:

Mr. J. Bruce Glasier [I. L. P.], moved the following resolution:

“That this conference expresses satisfaction at the growth of political organization among the workers of our own and other lands, which has advanced the whole sphere of social and industrial legislation. It again affirms that the aim of the labor movement is to abolish poverty and class oppression by bringing land and industrial capital under the ownership and control of the community for the collective good of all, believing that only by this means and by establishing complete political freedom will

society be placed on a true human basis and the higher individual and social capacities of the race have freedom to evolve."

He said . . . the object of the resolution was not to impose a creed on the party; it simply meant a public confession of faith on the part of the Conference. . . .

Mr. J. Battle [United Textile Factory Workers] said he was exceedingly anxious, especially as regarded land, . . . but he could not agree in every detail with the . . . proposal . . . that a tax should be placed on land and that the money which thereby accrued should go to the repurchase of the land of their birth. He held the view that the land of every country undoubtedly belonged to the people of that country, and . . . the necessary conclusion was that the people had a right to resume control without being compelled to purchase. He suggested that a tax should be placed on land so high as ultimately to take possession of the value of the land, and the present owners would then see no use in holding it any longer.

Mr. R. Clements [Birmingham L. R. C.] supported the resolution, and said that by means of a tax they might regain possession of the value of the land, but the most important thing was control of the land.

The resolution was put and declared carried.

2. THE LABOR PARTY AND A PROGRAM

(Conference of 1914)

Several efforts have been made to get the Labor Party to adopt a definite program. A motion to that effect was put at the 1914 Conference:

Mr. J. Brand [Railwaymen] moved the following:

"That in order to give the working-classes of this country an opportunity of clearly understanding the fundamental differences between the aims of the Labor Party and those of the capitalist parties under legislation, this conference decides to draft a program to be adopted by the party, the same to consist of such items as shall tend to strengthen the working-class in their struggle for emancipation."

He said the framing of a program would stimulate public

opinion and further the interests of the party in the country. It would materially assist the propaganda work.

The previous question was moved and seconded . . . the result was as follows:

For	1,078,000
Against	785,000
.

CHAPTER XX

THE FABIAN SOCIETY AND SOCIALIST UNITY

1. INTRODUCTORY

THE Fabian Society is not primarily a political organization, although it has exerted a considerable influence on British politics and especially on the Socialist movement.

The Fabian Society was founded in 1889 for the purpose of Socialist education and propaganda. It is democratically organized and open to the public, but has never had more than a few thousand members. Its influence, however, is far greater than its numbers would indicate, as the names of its two best-known organizers, Bernard Shaw and Sidney Webb, will prove. Besides these, it has on its roll the names of hundreds of writers and lecturers well-known in Great Britain and a considerable number internationally known also.

The society has always sent delegates to the International Socialist Congresses and takes an active part in elections. Though it officially supports the Labor Party, its members are free to vote for whomsoever they choose in elections. They must, however, sign the following "Basis" on joining the society:

2. BASIS OF THE FABIAN SOCIETY

The Fabian Society consists of Socialists.

It therefore aims at the reorganization of society by the emancipation of land and industrial capital from individual and class ownership, and the vesting of them in the community for

the general benefit. In this way only can the natural and acquired advantages of the country be equitably shared by the whole people.

The society accordingly works for the extinction of private property in land and of the consequent individual appropriation, in the form of rent, of the price paid for permission to use the earth, as well as for the advantages of superior soils and sites.

The society, further, works for the transfer to the community of the administration of such industrial capital as can conveniently be managed socially. For, owing to the monopoly of the means of production in the past, industrial inventions, and the transformation of surplus income into capital have mainly enriched the proprietary class, the worker being now dependent on that class for leave to earn a living.

If these measures be carried out, without compensation (though not without such relief to expropriated individuals as may seem fit to the community), rent and interest will be added to the reward of labor, the idle class now living on the labor of others will necessarily disappear, and practical equality of opportunity will be maintained by the spontaneous action of economic forces with much less interference with personal liberty than the present system entails.

For the attainment of these ends the Fabian Society looks to the spread of Socialist opinions, and the social and political changes consequent thereon. It seeks to promote these by the general dissemination of knowledge as to the relation between the individual and society in its economic, ethical, and political aspects.

3. QUESTIONS FOR CANDIDATES

The following questions are addressed to parliamentary candidates by the Fabians:

Will you press at the first opportunity for the following reforms:

I.—*A Labor Program*

1. The extension of the Workmen's Compensation Act to seamen, and to all other classes of wage-earners?
2. Compulsory arbitration, as in New Zealand, to prevent strikes and lockouts?

3. A statutory minimum wage, as in Victoria, especially for sweated trades?

4. The fixing of "an eight hours' day" as the maximum for all public servants; and the abolition, wherever possible, of overtime?

5. An Eight Hours' Bill, without an option clause, for miners; and, for railway servants, a forty-eight hours' week?

6. The drastic amendment of the Factory Acts, to secure (a) a safe and healthy work-place for every worker, (b) the prevention of overwork for all women and young persons, (c) the abolition of all wage-labor by children under 14, (d) compulsory technical instruction by extension of the half-time arrangements to all workers under 18?

7. The direct employment of labor by all public authorities whenever possible; and, whenever it is not possible, employment only of fair houses, prohibition of subcontracting, and payment of trade-union rates of wages?

8. The amendment of the Merchant Shipping Acts so as (a) to secure healthy sleeping and living accommodation, (b) to protect the seaman against withholding of his wages or return passage, (c) to insure him against loss by shipwreck?

II.—*A Democratic Budget*

9. The further taxation of unearned incomes by means of a graduated and differentiated income-tax?

10. The abolition of all duties on tea, cocoa, coffee, currants, and other dried fruits?

11. An increase of the scale of graduation of the death duties so as to fall more heavily on large inheritances?

12. The appropriation of the unearned increment by the taxation and rating of ground values?

13. The nationalization of mining rents and royalties?

14. Transfer of the railways to the state under the Act of 1844?

III.—*Social Reform in Town and Country*

15. The extension of full powers to parish, town, and county councils for the collective organization of the (a) water, (b) gas, and (c) electric lighting supplies, (d) hydraulic power, (e) tramways and light railways, (f) public slaughter-houses, (g)

pawnshops, (*h*) sale of milk, (*i*) bread, (*j*) coal, and such other public services as may be desired by the inhabitants?

16. Reform of the drink traffic by (*a*) reduction of the number of licenses to a proper ratio to the population of each locality, (*b*) transfer to public purposes of the special value of licenses, created by the existing monopoly, by means of high license or a license rate, (*c*) grant of power to local authorities to carry on municipal public houses, directly or on the Gothenburg system?

17. Amendment of the Housing of the Working-Classes Act by (*a*) extension of period of loans to one hundred years, treatment of land as an asset, and removal of statutory limitation of borrowing powers for housing, (*b*) removal of restrictions on rural district councils in adopting Part III of the Act, (*c*) grant of power to parish councils to adopt Part III of the Act, (*d*) power to all local authorities to buy land compulsorily under the allotments clauses of the Local Government Act, 1894, or in any other effective manner?

18. The grant of power to all local bodies to retain the freehold of any land that may come into their possession, without obligation to sell, or to use for particular purposes?

19. The relief of the existing taxpayer by (*a*) imposing, for local purposes, a municipal death duty on local real estate, collected in the same way as the existing death duties, (*b*) collecting rates from the owners of empty houses and vacant land, (*c*) power to assess land and houses at four per cent on the capital value, (*d*) securing special contributions by way of "betterment" from the owners of property benefited by public improvements?

20. The further equalization of the rates in London?

21. The compulsory provision by every local authority of adequate hospital accommodation for all diseases and accidents?

IV.—*The Children and the Poor*

22. The prohibition of the industrial or wage-earning employment of children during school terms prior to the age of 14?

23. The provision of meals, out of public funds, for necessitous children in public elementary schools?

24. The training of teachers under public control and free from sectarian influences?

25. The creation of a complete system of public secondary education genuinely available to the children of the poor?

26. State pensions for the support of the aged or chronically infirm?

V.—Democratic Political Machinery

27. An amendment of the registration laws, with the aim of giving every adult man a vote, and no one more than one vote?

28. A redistribution of seats in accordance with population?

29. The grant of the franchise to women on the same terms as to men?

30. The admission of women to seats in the House of Commons and on borough and county councils?

31. The second ballot at parliamentary and other elections?

32. The payment of all members of Parliament and of parliamentary election expenses, out of public funds?

33. Triennial Parliaments?

34. All parliamentary elections to be held on the same day?

4. THE FABIANS AND SOCIALIST UNITY

On December 11, 1914, the Fabian Society took the stand on the unity question indicated in the following report (from *The Fabian News*, January, 1915):

The following was submitted to the consideration of the meeting by the Executive Committee:

The following resolution was passed at the Conference of the executives of the I. L. P., the B. S. P., and the Fabian Society, held on December 13, 1913, at the request of the International Socialist Bureau: "That in view of the desirability of securing Socialist unity on the basis of common action with the Labor Party, this conference requests the representatives of the three bodies to lay before their members the question of putting forward a proposal to the Labor Party Conference in 1915, permitting any candidate who may wish it to describe himself as a Labor and Socialist candidate."

W. Stephen Sanders stated that the resolution passed at the Conference of the executives of the I. L. P., the B. S. P., and the Fabian Society was simply a request that the proposal that candidates of the Labor Party might be permitted to describe themselves as Labor and Socialist candidates, if they desire to

do so, should be submitted to the members of the three bodies. It was not binding on the three organizations to accept the proposal, and it was therefore open for the meeting to accept or reject it.

Miss Susan Lawrence moved that no action be taken. She stated that if the present arrangement, under which candidates of the Labor Party were always described as Labor candidates, was upset, a great deal of friction and waste of time would result in connection with the selection of Labor candidates. Local labor parties would find that lengthy discussions would arise with regard to the title under which their candidates were to run, with the result that real unity would be hindered.

Mrs. Sidney Webb seconded the motion.

Bernard Shaw objected to no action being taken. He urged that the name Socialist ought not to be buried. In every country in Europe there was a Socialist Party, and Great Britain ought not to be the exception.

On a vote being taken there were: for the motion, "No action," 25; against, 20. The motion was therefore carried.

5. THE ANNUAL CONFERENCE, 1914

This conference was held at Clifford's Inn Hall, Fleet Street, on Saturday, July 4, 1914. It was attended by 11 delegates from 9 local Fabian societies, 13 delegates from 9 university societies, 1 delegate from 1 London group, 11 delegates from 4 subject groups, and 17 members of the Executive Committee, in all 53 delegates and 24 organizations, including the executive committee.

The Conference voted down a resolution proposing a revision of the Fabian Basis.

Perhaps its most important action was the adoption, by the unanimous vote, of the following resolution of the Executive Committee:

That, in the opinion of this conference, it would be of advantage to the Socialist movement if, in order to secure more united action among Socialists in each country, and among the Socialist

movements in the different countries, the International Socialist Congress and its Bureau could devote some attention to the problem of how industry and public services may best be organized so as to secure the utmost freedom and the best results for producers and consumers alike; and that the British section be requested to do their best to insure the passing at the International Socialist Congress of the resolution on this subject which the section has sent it.

In *The New Statesman*, Sidney Webb had issued two studies of this question in 1913 and 1914 (the third and final study appearing in 1915). The Fabian Society, therefore, through its Research Department, was prepared with a preliminary report on "The Control of Industry"—which amounts to *an entirely new and independent inductive foundation for Socialist policy*. The three studies take up collectivism, the organization of producers, and the organization of consumers—the latter being chiefly concerned with labor-unionism and co-operation respectively.

II. SOCIALIST UNITY ON THE BASIS OF COMMON ACTION WITH THE LABOR PARTY

1. MANIFESTO OF THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST BUREAU

In accordance with its general principle of unifying the Socialist parties of the various countries, the International Socialist Bureau appointed a committee on unity to investigate the British situation, and to find out under what conditions it would be advisable for members of the British Socialist Party to affiliate with the Labor Party. The Bureau, on January 13, 1914, issued the following manifesto:

13th January, 1914.

COMRADES:

We address this Manifesto to you in the name of the whole International.

When we met your delegates at the preliminary conference on the 18th July, 1913, the executive committee of the International Socialist Bureau was already acting in the name of all the affiliated parties, in pursuance of the resolution of Amsterdam on Socialist unity. The International as a whole showed its desire, by the presence of all its delegates in London on 13th December, to give open approval and encouragement to our efforts in favor of the establishment of Socialist unity in Great Britain.

There is no doubt that in principle all convinced Socialists recognize the utility and the necessity of opposing to the growing concentration of the capitalist forces the effective concentration of the forces of the working-class.

This is proved by the fact that as long ago as 1904, at the Congress at Amsterdam, the British delegates, without distinction of shades of opinion, unanimously adopted the well-known resolution of unity, which was signed by Bebel, Adler, Kautsky, Troelstra, and Vandervelde.

The Executive Committee of the bureau was then in duty bound to seize the most favorable moment for bringing about an understanding, and it cannot be reproached with having attempted to "rush" matters, since it has waited nine years before taking any action.

Great Britain has presented to the world the spectacle of a country where capitalist evolution has taken place more rapidly than anywhere else. The hope was justified that Socialism would follow a similar evolution. But unfortunately it has turned out that regrettable differences have arisen, and even to-day it seems that in certain quarters there is more inclination to cultivate a sectarian spirit than to march in common agreement against the common enemy. Such a mistaken policy must not continue! The consequences would be ruinous for the class-conscious proletariat, for more and more we are finding that all over the world Socialism only plays a part worthy of itself when it is solidly united.

From a practical point of view, moreover, we cannot see that the differences of outlook are greater in your country than elsewhere.

Look at France. Has she not given to the Socialist world an admirable example? The French Socialists, in spite of old quarrels now forgotten, have established a powerful, unified

party—thus giving to all an example of political wisdom and of loyalty to the principles so solemnly affirmed by the congresses of the International at which you were represented.

Socialism must not be obscured, and the Socialist movement must not be hindered, even temporarily, by considerations of secondary importance, by personal differences, by a sectarian spirit, or by divergent conceptions of political methods. Those who are guilty in this respect commit a real crime against the working-class, for they retard the hour of complete victory.

The delegates of your three parties have realized this. Their unanimous vote proves that there no longer exists any plausible reason for refusing the necessary agreement. The Executive Committee of the B. S. P. has already recommended to its members that they should affiliate to the Labor Party on condition that the Labor Party recognizes their position as Socialists aiming at the abolition of capitalism.

We also appeal to our comrades of the I. L. P. and the Fabian Society to use their influence within the Labor Party to obtain for candidates at elections the right to run as Labor and Socialist candidates. The slight alteration in the constitution necessary for this purpose will only mean the formal recognition of what already exists in fact—the alliance of Socialism and Trade-Unionism.

We renew our appeal to our comrades of the B. S. P. to bear in mind the truth, which is recognized everywhere, that trade-union action can have no other logical issue than the abolition of capitalism and that Socialist ideas must inevitably prevail in organizations which are in fact carrying on the class struggle.

The final request which we make is that you act quickly and without hesitation. At the Congress of Vienna, British Socialism must speak with one voice. You must give to the Socialist world a new example of discipline, in order to enable us to continue elsewhere the work of consolidation and harmony, on which depends the ultimate triumph of the Socialist movement.

For the International Socialist Bureau (Executive Committee):

(Signed) E. ANSEELE,
É. VANDERVELDE,
L. BERTRAND,
C. HUYSMANS, Secretary.

2. THE UNITY CONFERENCE

(Called by the International Socialist Bureau, December 13, 1913)

The Bureau held a joint conference with the executives of the three national Socialist organizations in Great Britain—the Independent Labor Party, the British Socialist Party, and the Fabian Society—with a view to bringing about unity between them. The differences which have divided the three British organizations have been purely differences of method. On the right wing, the Fabian Society has pursued the policy of “permeation,” and, whilst affiliating with the Labor Party, has not demanded that its members shall individually dissociate themselves from either the Liberal or the Conservative parties. On the left wing, the British Socialist Party has adopted an attitude of strict independence, not only of the Liberal and Conservative parties, but also of the Labor Party, since the latter party does not insist upon acceptance of Socialism from affiliated organizations. In the center, the Independent Labor Party has declared its antagonism to both the Liberal and Conservative parties, but has co-operated whole-heartedly with the trade-unions in the Labor Party, believing that Socialism can only be attained by the development of Socialist conviction in the working-class movement. The I. L. P. has a membership of approximately 50,000, the B. S. P. of 10,000, the Fabian Society of 5,000.

After a vigorous discussion, Mr. Sidney Webb finally got each section of the British movement to agree to the following resolution:

That in view of the desirability of securing Socialist unity on the basis of common action with the Labor Party, this conference requests the representatives of the three bodies to lay before

their members the question of putting forward a proposal to the Labor Party Conference in 1915, permitting any candidate who may wish it to describe himself as a Labor and Socialist candidate.

3. DISCUSSION IN THE BRITISH SOCIALIST PARTY

(Conference of 1914)

The British Socialist Party, the left wing of the Socialist movement, held a heated debate on the question of affiliation, Dan Irving, H. M. Hyndman, the veteran leader, and others urging a compliance with the request of the International Committee, and H. Pearce and others vigorously protesting.

The report of the conference discussion is in part as follows:

Dan Irving: The International Socialist Bureau was trustee, not of Laborism, but of the Socialist movement of the whole world. Under very much more arduous conditions in the main than ever we are called upon to face they proved, by a lifetime of devotion, service, and suffering, that they could be trusted to advise that which tended to help forward the Socialist movement. They might now say to the B. S. P., "For nine years you have sought to carry out the mandate, and are now as far from carrying your specific views as at the commencement, if not farther away. In the interests of Socialism we call upon you, who are only a section of the movement in Great Britain, and the recalcitrant section so far as we are concerned, to realize the mandate of the Amsterdam resolution in essence and spirit, and to face every danger for that vital consideration, the consolidation of the working-class."

Mr. H. Pearce [N. West Ham], who followed, opposed the motion of the executive to affiliate, declaring that such action would mean affiliation inside of the House of Commons as well as outside. He described what he considered to be the shortcomings of the Parliamentary Labor group, and said that the I. L. P., the Fabian Society, and the Labor Party had never stood on the basis of the class struggle. Some of the members of the Labor Party, he asserted, had declared themselves anti-Socialists and most of them acted as non-Socialists. While he

avored Socialist unity, he did not believe that unity of Socialists and anti-Socialists could ever bring any good to the Socialist movement. He did not believe that the B. S. P. would be able to force the Labor Party to take the stand it wished them to take, but rather that the B. S. P. would be swamped by the other forces.

As to the International Socialist Bureau, he had challenged some of the advocates of affiliation to show him in any part of the world a party that the continental Social Democrats would have welcomed into their movement which was comparable with the Labor Party.

H. M. Hyndman said that the S. D. F. was in its early days a purely propagandist body; but when that propaganda had in a measure succeeded, he was sorry to say—although he advocated it at the time—the S. D. F. left the Labor Party. Had we remained, that party would have had a different history. The present conference did not show that the 33 or 34 years of Socialist propaganda had produced a satisfactory result, and the reason was that we had never got near enough to those we wanted to convert. To a large extent they even looked upon us as enemies. If we went in we should do so with the red flag flying, in order to take Socialism to them and help them to victory. Our presence inside that party would increase our influence tenfold upon the working-class of this country, who only wanted to understand the truth to come out, side by side with us, for the conquest of the future. In these days when the capitalist class was banded together, we must get all the forces of the proletariat under one flag, and take care that in the future that flag should be the Red Flag.

A motion to apply for affiliation was finally carried.

4. DECLARATION OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF BRITISH SOCIALIST PARTY UPON APPLYING FOR AFFILIATION IN THE LABOR PARTY (May 27, 1914):

To the Members of the British Socialist Party

COMRADES:

The referendum of the financial members of the British Socialist Party on the proposals submitted by the International Socialist Bureau has now been taken. They have decided in favor of Socialist unity and affiliation to the National Labor Party.

In taking this step the British Socialist Party does not lose its identity or surrender its position in any way. It retains complete freedom of Socialist action both in the propagandist and electoral fields. It is not committed to any compromise of principle or policy.

The Labor Party in the country and its parliamentary group must not be regarded as one and the same thing. Already many of the trade-unionists who constitute that party recognize that the Labor Party in the House of Commons has not shown the political independence which was the main reason for the formation of the Labor Party. The growing demand within the Labor Party itself for complete political independence will unquestionably be stimulated and strengthened by the addition of definite Socialist forces, determined to push forward Socialist principles and ideas with vigor and persistence. Within the Labor Party, therefore, our criticism of the parliamentary group, whilst aiming always at being helpful, must be no less forceful and pointed. We shall find that this necessary criticism will have much greater weight than hitherto, now that we shall form a left wing of the Labor Party.

Comparisons have been made between the situation in this country and abroad. Whatever difference there may be in the situation arises from the fact that on the Continent the organization of the trade-unions has grown out of the Socialist conception of the mission of the working-class; whereas in this country the trade-unions arose out of a vague feeling of working-class solidarity, coupled with the necessity for organization to resist the pressure of capitalist exploitation. The class struggle abroad is far more class conscious than it is here. Our purpose now, as always, is to convert the organized workers of Great Britain to our Social Democratic ideals, and to convince them of the reality of the class struggle and of its revolutionary character.

The trade-unionists constitute the best, the ablest, and the most energetic of the British working-class. There is no better field for the propaganda of our revolutionary doctrines. Our best work has been and must be done among them; and we shall do it much more successfully in the future within the Labor Party than hitherto outside.

Moreover, we shall help, as a definite organized Social Democratic Party, the work of those of our members who, as trade-

unionists, have been doing all they can to secure thoroughgoing political independence in the Labor Party itself. Affiliation to the Labor Party will enable us now to proceed immediately to establish the Joint Socialist Council with the I. L. P. and the Fabian Society, and prepare the way for the realization of united Socialist action. Here, again, patience and persistence are both essential to our work. The principles of revolutionary Social Democracy, revolutionary in the sense of being thorough and uncompromising, will make more rapid progress if we avoid antagonizing unnecessarily those who may not see altogether with us at the moment.

Comrades, you have given us the mandate to affiliate to the Labor Party. We shall carry out that mandate with the supreme confidence that by the time of our next annual conference the B. S. P. will have so strengthened its position and increased its membership as to encourage those who have worked for this step towards Socialist unity, and to remove all doubts from the minds of those who, sincerely opposing it, will yet loyally abide by the decision of the majority.

THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE BRITISH
SOCIALIST PARTY.

[NOTE—Because of the refusal of the Labor Party to allow any of its candidates to list themselves as Labor and Socialist candidates, the proposed unity was not carried out. See above, pp. 290 and 294.]

CHAPTER XXI

IRELAND

I. THE POLITICAL SITUATION IN IRELAND

(From *Vorwaerts*, September 10, 1913)

“THE recent events in Dublin will strongly promote the split which has been noticeable for some time past, in the apparently closed ranks of Irish Nationalism. This is the opinion of Comrade Connolly, now in prison, the historian of the Irish proletariat, as well as of Comrade Sheehy Skeffington, the biographer of Michael Davitt. Skeffington prophesies for the coming Irish Parliament the following political line up: the reds against the blacks.

“Up to the present, Ireland has known but two parties, separated from each other by religion and race. The Nationalists have the power in their hands in three out of the four provinces. Their party membership consists almost wholly of Irish Catholics, but also contains a small number of Protestants. . . . In Ulster, the fourth province, the population is half Nationalistic and half of Unionistic sentiment. Ulster is strongly industrial. The Unionists are the descendants of English and Scotch pioneers, who took possession of the estates from which the Irish Catholics were driven in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. These form ‘the Protestant garrison’ of England in Ireland, oppressed for centuries. They favor the union formed in 1800 between the two islands, support the English Conservatives, and are violent opponents of Irish self-government. They fear religious, political, and economic oppression from a predominantly Catholic Par-

liament in Dublin. The Nationalists, on the other hand, go with the English Liberals, who have given them as a sign of gratitude for their support the Home Rule Bill. This party struggle has lasted, with slight interruptions, for several centuries.

“The future fate of the Nationalistic Party is of the greatest interest to us. This party has so far been able to hold together the opposing elements of the Irish nation by the declaration that all class interests must be checked for the sake of the holy, patriotic, general cause.

“How strong Nationalism is in the Irish capital can be seen on entering the town. The street signs do not alone show the name of the street in English, but also in Irish, which is spoken and understood only by a few inhabitants in the extreme west of the country. If you ask a man in Dublin to guide you to Sackville Street, he will think you are a Tory and say: ‘I suppose you mean O’Connell Street?’ The Dubliner refuses to call the principal street, in which stands the monument of the liberator, O’Connell, the emancipator of the Catholics, by anything but O’Connell Street. The Government, by the way, has forbidden the use of this street to the workers on Sunday, although the Nationalistic leaders have frequently held undisturbed meetings. This Nationalism is strongly nursed by the English Government, which never allows the Dubliner to forget that he lives under foreign rule.

“The police of the capital, known for its brutality towards the public, is directed by the English governor, or, better, the arrogant English bureaucrats, who look down upon the ‘wild Irish,’ live in a part of the town by themselves, and avoid the society of the inhabitants. These apparent signs of foreign rule are still more noticeable in the country. Here the trained Irish constables rule with gun and bayonet. The large number of policemen bears

no proportion to the number of crimes, which are smaller in proportion to population than in Great Britain. It were a wonder if the Nationalistic Party, led by the bourgeois elements, would not have a hold on the minds of the people in such a country.

“But the developments of the last years have shown that the discipline in the ranks of the Nationalistic Party has become less, and that portions of the party have been separated from it. The land question and the Home Rule Bill have played the most important part in the politics of Ireland for the last generation. But now, since the land question has been solved for the present by the Land Act, and since Home Rule is only a question of months, the people are beginning to look around. The predominantly small-bourgeois Nationalistic Party has for some years past been ready to become entirely a Catholic party. Its former election organization, ‘The United Irish League,’ the direct successor of the land league, recedes more and more before the ‘Ancient Order of Hibernians,’ led by Delegate Devlin, who pretends to be a believer in democracy. The United Irish League is an organization which has Catholic and Protestant members, while the rapidly growing Ancient Order of Hibernians admits Catholics only. But this gradual spiritual change in the party has not been the only change. Large capitalistic, bourgeois, and proletarian-democratic elements have also withdrawn from ‘official’ nationalism.

“First mention must be made of the small, independent Nationalistic Party, whose delegate in the Parliament at Westminster is the deputy, Healy, most faithful to the high clergy of the Catholic Church. The financier of this party is the Dublin merchant, Murphy, who has declared war against the working-class movement. The Healyites look and find support among the English Conservatives,

in whose ranks are many adherents of the high church, at heart Catholics, who have a strong influence. According to Healy, the English Conservatives, not the English Liberals, are the natural allies of Irish nationalism. As an example, he cites the local administration acts of the Conservative Party of the year 1898. The law gave local home rule to the Irish, whose local affairs, up to that time, had been attended to by 'grand juries' made up principally of Protestant landowners.

"Several years ago bourgeois and proletarian elements broke away from the other wing of the party and founded the all-Irish movement. The new party, opposing the 'official' Nationalistic Party, called itself *Sinn Fein*, which means 'We ourselves.' It was a seceding, radical Nationalism which found expression in this movement. It expressed itself in the cultivation of the Irish language and the Irish industries, in attacks on the parliamentary party, and even in attacks against the clergy. A large number of Socialistically inclined workers joined this movement, among others, Connolly, Daly (secretary of the Irish Trade-Union Congress), and the trade-union secretary, Partridge. The workers, who had greeted the *Sinn Fein* Party as a democratic people's party, and had worked hard to spread it, found before long that they had been cheated. The leadership was gradually and quietly taken over by Irish industrials, who got rid of the democratic and anti-clerical influences and changed the all-Irish people's party into a movement for the introduction of the protective tariff. To-day, now that the *Sinn Fein* Party has lost its working-class leaders, it has deteriorated into a small sect without a future.

"The Socialist working-class movement has taken its place. This movement has so far had little chance to develop in Ireland. The Irish 'Independent Labor Party,'

which was formed two or three years ago from two Socialist unions, has at present about 800 members. Some of the best known and most influential union secretaries belong to it. Not much older is the Irish Workingmen's Party, which is the acknowledged representative of the Irish unions. This party's effort to have their representatives elected to various town councils met with unexpected success. In Dublin, where the town council consists of 80 members, the Workingmen's Party has 7 representatives; of the other members, 10 are from the Union Party; 3 or 4 of the *Sinn Féin* Party, and the rest from the Nationalist Party, the United Irish League, and the Ancient Order of Hibernians. The youthful party has 6 town representatives in Sligo, 4 in Wexford, and 3 in Waterford. It is expected that larger results will be obtained at the next election. It is the intention of the party to oust the Nationalists at the county elections.

“All this has created a depressed feeling in the ranks of the Nationalistic Party. This party realizes that the support of the workers is lost. It has partly been able to check the aspirations of the Workingmen's Party. After the proposal for the Home Rule Bill, the greatest number of seats available to the representatives of the workers is 40 out of 164. To gain a larger representation the workers would have to go back to the old parties. The Catholic clergy are working strenuously to check the growth of the Workingmen's Party. Their fight is directed principally against Socialism. Comrade Larkin and his associates are heralded as monsters. The fight is nevertheless difficult for the priests. For Larkin, who is hated by the propertied class, is loved by the people. The Catholic worker says: ‘Jim Larkin might be a Socialist, but he is a good fellow just the same.’ The clergy is striving hard to dispel this opinion.

“The Nationalistic Party has been discredited by the workers. The secretary of their strongest party organization created the yellow street car union, which found so much favor in the eyes of Mr. Murphy. It was the Government which the party supported that trampled down the representatives of the Dublin workers, without the public protest of one member of the Nationalistic Party. Nationalistic employers follow Mr. Murphy in his attack on the transportation workers’ union.

“It is now quite apparent that a split will occur in the near future in the Nationalistic Party. Probably two parties, the Socialist Party and the Clerical Party, will before long be opposing each other in the future Irish Parliament. The fact that up to the present time the oppressor of the Irishmen was in many instances their religious and national opponent, gave little opportunity for the growth of class consciousness among the Irish wage-earners. The new political situation has cleared matters to a certain extent. Even the union worker of Ulster will soon recognize who in the new Ireland is his natural ally. A Dublin union employee said to me: ‘When the Belfasters see that home rulers have no intention of bringing the pope to Ireland they will become reasonable and unite with us.’

“Comrade Connolly, secretary of the Belfast section of the Irish Transport Workers’ Union, declared: ‘The Belfast workers will supply us with the most able men in the workingmen’s movement.’

“The clearing of the air in the labor movement resulting from the struggles in Dublin in this time of transition seems to indicate a rapid development of the Irish workers toward political independence. Perhaps some of the Irish comrades are too optimistic and undervalue the power of the Catholic clergy, which functions as the most aristocratic election agent of the Nationalistic Party. One thing

is certain: The stone has been set rolling in Ireland and the Irish working-class, which has sacrificed many martyrs to nationalism, has become class conscious."

THE FOUNDATION OF THE IRISH LABOR PARTY

Speech by James Larkin, Chairman

We are living in momentous times, but we who have been elected to take up and carry still further the banner which was hoisted by the pioneers 21 years ago in this city cannot afford to make mistakes. The knowledge gained in the bitter days of the past should strengthen us in our deliberations and work in the future. We are now on the threshold of a newer movement, with a newer hope and new inspiration. The best thanks we can offer those who have gone before and who have raised the Irish working-class from their knees, is to press forward with determination and enthusiasm towards the ultimate goal of their efforts, viz., a "Co-operative Commonwealth for Ireland." In the meantime, the immediate work to hand is the establishment of a new party—a Labor Party—an industrial army; a political party whose politics will be the assurance of bread and butter for all. . . .

The question of Home Rule—the question of what some people called religion—has been used to divide us in the past. The question of religion is a matter for each individual's conscience, and in a great many cases has been the outcome of birth or residence in a certain geographical area. Claiming for ourselves liberty of conscience, liberty of worship, we shall see to it that every other individual enjoys the same right, for intolerance has been the curse of this country. . . .

The Irish working-class are now rising from their knees and attaining full stature. The new Irish party has come of age, entered into its inheritance, and will stand erect upon its feet from this day onward. Looking back over the immediate past—more particularly the long months of 1913 and the early months of 1914—we see there the attempt of an organized, unscrupulous capitalist class composed of men of different political parties and holding different sectarian views, who have combined together for the purpose of destroying organized labor in Ireland. The lockout of 1913 was a deliberate attempt to starve the workers

into submission and met with well-deserved failure. The workers emerged from the struggle purified and strengthened, with a fierce determination and a fixed purpose. The employers' attitude was a direct attack upon the essential principles of trades-unionism. The outcome of the attack has been the initiating of a new principle of solidarity inside the unions, and for the first time in the history of the world the beautiful and more humane principle has received universal recognition, viz., "An injury to one is the concern of all." That motto will be emblazoned on the banner of labor the world over in the future. . . . Once again the Dublin worker stands as pioneer in the upward and onward march of labor. . . .

As much as I respect the church to which I belong, and the view of those who are interpreters of the dogmas of that church, and as much as I respect the opinions of members of any and every church, I make this claim—that as long as the working-class allows any churchman to abuse his trust and interfere in working affairs in the industrial world, so long will they have to submit to hunger, privation, and wage-slavery. In matters spiritual the workers will obey the church, but on the economic and industrial field we will be guided by knowledge gained by long and hard servitude. I submit that the working-class have as much right as any section or class in the community to enjoy all the advantages of science, art, and literature. No field of knowledge, no outlook in life should be closed against the workers. They should demand their share in the effulgence of life, and all that was created for the enjoyment of mankind. And here do I appeal to those who cannot see eye to eye with us, who feel that they cannot come all the way, to come with us as far as their knowledge will permit—come at least to the bottom of the boreen, and then, if we must part, the pioneers will continue on and up the mountain to meet the dawning of the new to-morrow. The working-class must be free, not only economically but intellectually.

I desire to bring you back for the moment, and would speak with you on one or two points of the struggle in Dublin last year. We saw too plainly then that sectionalism carried with it defeat amongst the working-class. We had 37 unions engaged in the struggle, each acting upon its own line of defense and attack and according to its own methods. Those who were engaged had shown magnificent courage. Women and men, aye,

and little children, had proved their heroism. Hunger, the jail, and death itself did not deter them. Let us not forget our comrades, Brady, Nolan, and Byrne, who were murdered in the streets of this city by the hired hooligans of the capitalist class—the police. We found that no political party, no church, made a protest against the abuse of the laws by the capitalist class. During that period it was shown clearly that there was neither Unionist nor Nationalist among the employing class. There were but two camps—employers and workers. We found no Redmondites, Carsonites, or O'Brienites then; the enemy were all employers, and every weapon they could wield—political, social, and administrative—they used unsparingly.

Let us not talk of wooden guns or tin guns. What the working-class wants is the gun of intelligence. Let solidarity be the watchword, and a few years will broaden out the liberties curtailed by the most unscrupulous and most vindictive capitalist class that any country ever was cursed with. Police, politicians, press, and the judges on the bench are simply the tools of the capitalist class. . . .

The cursed lines of sectarian and political demarcation must be wiped away; they must hunt the fomentors of such bigotry and intolerance out of the trade-union movement. No employer ever asked a man whether he was a Nationalist or a Catholic, Unionist or Protestant. If a worker entered Queen's Island ship-building yard and stated that he would not work with an Orange lathe, a Protestant pneumatic riveter, or a Catholic anvil, he would be fired out at once. The workers must drop these party distinctions. One union is the way out, that union to embrace all departments of industry—engineers, shipbuilders, distributive trades, and transport workers, each of these sections looking particularly after its own work, but all of them bound together and working for the betterment of all men and women. Those who will not assist in this one union movement are on the side of the capitalist; they must either be with us or against us. We have no time to argue further with these men and women who stand for sectionalism; we must simply march over them to the conquest and control of industry and our own destiny.

There is another side of our lives which has been too long neglected—a line of advance which has not been taken seriously into consideration—the safest line of advance I speak of now, viz., the co-operative movement. In this city at the present

moment the annual congress of the British Co-operative Movement is being held. It is being attended by women and men from all parts of the earth. It would be news to many to know that we here in Ireland were pioneers in co-operation long before the Rochdale pioneers. There was a communistic colony down on Usher's quay, but it was crushed out by jealous and restrictive laws, like every good thing Ireland ever started. England made it its business to put a stop to it. The working-class of Ireland should be compelled to understand the worth of co-operation. Through its agents we could supply all that life needs by themselves and for themselves. It needs no further argument to favor it. Life itself is co-operation in its truest sense. . . .

To-day we see the birth of an Irish Labor Party, in which there will be no room for the old lines of cleavage; no politics, no disagreements, no misunderstandings. Cemented by their common needs, a working-class party that will concern itself with seeing to it that sufficient food, clothing, and shelter are enjoyed by women, men, and children. We have seen, too, during the last few months that the lawbreakers in Ulster have been allowed to break every law in the land, and, on the other hand, when labor held a constitutional meeting, we have witnessed the arrest and imprisonment of the leaders. That should be a lesson to the workers; the question of Redmondites, O'Brienites, or Carsonites should be a thing of the foolish past. We must unite as Laborites in the three-leaved shamrock of fellowship, with faith in our cause, hope in the realization of our cause, and charity to all men.

Throughout this country we have made a name of which we need never be ashamed. I hope we will see the day when we will take full advantage of our opportunities, cry *finis* to our differences, obliterate all jealousies from our ranks, when we will truly be Irish of the Irish, and give ear to all men who do worthy work. Let us be comrades in the truest sense of the word and join with our comrades the world over to advance the cause of the class to which we belong. On that day we will put upon our escutcheon a mark worthy of the trust reposed upon us twenty-one years ago. . . . I claim we have an opportunity given us of achieving much in the future in our beloved country, to work and live for, and, if need be, die, to win back, in the words of Erin's greatest living poet, for Kathleen Ni Houlihan her four beautiful green fields.

CHAPTER XXII

AUSTRALIA

I. INTRODUCTORY

1. THE AUSTRALIAN LABOR PARTY

THE Australian Labor Party is not a Socialist Party. But neither is the British Labor Party, which the Australian Party in many respects resembles. The British Party, however, is not only admitted to the International Socialist Congresses, but is given a larger vote there than all the British Socialist parties combined. Moreover, these latter organizations have voluntarily joined or applied for membership in the Labor Party. We may therefore conclude that Socialists are for the most part more than friendly to all genuine Labor parties. We therefore include the Australian Labor Party in the present volume.

2. ELECTIONS OF 1913

In the elections of 1911 the Labor Party had secured a majority both in the federal Senate and the federal House of Representatives. They found themselves seriously hampered by the federal constitution, especially since it prevented both thoroughgoing regulation or nationalization of trusts and corporations and the extension to the nation of the governmental regulation of wages and labor contracts. A referendum, proposing to legalize these two classes of national legislation, had been defeated in 1910 by a large majority. The Labor Party, however, was

forced once more to put forward these same issues, and, at the elections of 1913, they were again put to a referendum vote.

The Labor Party was opposed by a coalition of the other two parties. But in spite of this it increased its majority in the Senate, lost the House by only one vote, and was defeated in the referenda by margins so narrow that a change of one per cent of the votes cast would have given the Labor Party a complete victory—an astonishing advance in three years, indicating an almost certain victory in the near future.

The National Referenda

Nearly 1,900,000 votes were cast. The two labor measures were defeated by 31,000 and 37,000 votes respectively. The four measures dealing with the regulation of corporations and the nationalization of monopolies were defeated by majorities varying from 37,000 to a bare 14,000.

3. FEDERAL ELECTIONS OF 1914

	<i>Senate</i>				<i>House</i>				
	Before 1910	Election of 1910	Election of 1913	Election of 1914	Total seats	Before 1910	Election of 1910	Election of 1913	Election of 1914
New South Wales....	0	3	0	6	27—11	17	12	13	
Victoria	1	3	2	4	21—4	10	9	11	
Queensland	3	3	3	6	10—4	6	7	7	
South Australia	3	3	3	5	7—4	4	4	4	
West Australia	3	3	3	6	5—2	2	2	2	
Tasmania	0	3	0	5	5—1	3	3	3	
	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	10	18	11	32	75—26	42	37	40	
Total Anti-Labor.	8	0	7	4		49	33	38	35

4. GROWTH OF THE LABOR PARTY

In the Federal Parliament

The progress of labor through the five Parliaments of the Commonwealth is as follows:

<i>Senate</i>				<i>Representatives</i>			
Year	Labor	Anti-labor	Total members	Year	Labor	Anti-labor	Total members
1901.....	8	28	36	1901.....	16	59	75
1903.....	14	22	36	1903.....	25	50	75
1906.....	15	21	36	1906.....	26	49	75
1910.....	23	13	36	1910.....	42	33	75
1913.....	29	7	36	1913.....	37	38	75
1914.....	32	4	36	1914.....	40	35	75

5. THE LABOR VOTE IN 1914

The federal elections of September 5, 1914, resulted as follows:

The Senate—Votes in Thousands

	Labor		Gain	Anti-labor		Gain
	1913	1914		1913	1914	
Queensland	144	146	2	107	111	4
New South Wales...	324	343	19	318	341	23
Victoria	327	332	5	285	292	7
South Australia	108	112	4	87	90	3
West Australia	63	67	4	54	60	6
Tasmania	38	40	2	36	39	3
	1,004	1,040	36	887	933	46

In approximately 2,000,000 votes the Labor Party received over 100,000 majority. It carried all six states, though the vote was very close in New South Wales and Tasmania (as may be seen from the table above). As the

Labor Party majority in these two states was considerably larger in the previous year, it would seem that it stands in danger of losing them. All the other four states, however, seem to be firmly held.

6. THE LABOR PARTY IN THE STATES

(April, 1914)

The following is the position of labor in the state Parliaments:

State Legislative Assemblies

State	Labor	Anti-labor	Total mem- bers
New South Wales.....	49	41	90
Victoria	20	45	65
Queensland	24	48	72
South Australia	16	24	40
Western Australia	33	17	50
Tasmania	15	15	30
All State Assemblies.....	157	190	347

State Legislative Councils

State	Labor	Anti-labor	Total mem- bers
New South Wales.....	6	51	57
Victoria	4	30	34
Queensland	2	42	44
South Australia	6	12	18
Western Australia	7	23	30
Tasmania	—	18	18
	25	176	201

The State Legislative Councils are either appointed or elected under restricted suffrage laws, which have come down unchanged from the undemocratic state constitutions that preceded the formation of the Federal Common-

wealth in 1901. If the electoral conditions were the same as for the elections to the lower legislative assemblies, the Labor Party would control, as the above figures show, not only Tasmania—as at present—but also New South Wales and Western Australia.

If we judge by the federal elections to the House of Representatives, the Labor Party would control all the states except New South Wales.

Or, if we judge by the federal elections to the Senate, the Labor Party would firmly control Victoria, Queensland, South Australia, and West Australia, and would have a bare majority also in the other two states.

7. MANIFESTO OF LABOR PARTY FOR ELECTIONS OF 1913

FELLOW ELECTORS:

On the 31st of May you will be called upon to elect a new Parliament, and to vote upon six proposals to amend the constitution. There are but two parties before the country, and these the same as in 1910.

You are again asked to choose between the Labor Party and the Fusion Party. In view of the respective records of the two parties, the issue—notwithstanding the most desperate efforts to mislead the electors by flagrant misrepresentation, by distortion, by suppression of the truth—is clear, simple, and hardly in doubt. The facts of the country's prosperity, its amazing strides in trade, manufacture, banking assets and deposits, the savings of the people, and the increase of population, both oversea and native born, are before the people and cannot be explained away. They furnish the most complete and crushing refutation of all those dire prophecies of evil with which the fusion leaders and the fusion press attempted to alarm the people at the last election and which they are again repeating.

The Labor Party's Record

The Labor Party has been in office three years. It has been a party of action. Its record is before the people. We have not space to deal with that record in detail, but may fairly remind the electors of two points, both of first importance.

One: The fact—rare, if not unique in this country—that every promise made to the electors in the 1910 manifesto has been faithfully performed. Where the constitution permitted, legislative effect has been given to our policy. What we promised, that we have performed.

The other: That we have not only put our policy on the statute book and energetically administered it, but that its effects have been most salutary.

The Fusion's Tribute to Labor's Record

The first tribute to the value of our policy is the attitude of the fusion, which, after denouncing and abusing the Labor Party and all its works, dare not venture to say it will repeal one act of the 83 which we have passed. This is surely the best testimony the electors can have of the value of the Labor Party's work, and conclusive proof of the hollowness of the fusion's denunciations and abuse of the Labor Party and its platform.

.

The Three Great Questions

The three great questions that force themselves upon the attention of the people of all civilized nations to-day are: (1) Industrial unrest; (2) the operations of trusts and combines; and (3) increased cost of living. These three things go down to bedrock. They touch and condition the lives of 95 per cent of the people. In every country they exist, and exist alongside each other.

That they are here in Australia we know perfectly well, and any party which seeks to govern a country must not only recognize their existence, but put forward a policy to cope with them. And as these great factors have their causes deep down in the very roots of modern industrialism, no policy which does not deal with basic causes as well as their effects can help the people.

The Fusion Policy

The Fusion Party does not even attempt to put forward such a policy. So far as it deals with industrial unrest, and high cost of living, it declares them to be purely local phenomena confined to Australia. It lays the responsibility for their exist-

ence at the door of the Labor Party. As for trusts and combines, it now declares the existing law to be amply sufficient. And the Fusion remedy for all these things, in common with every other ill from which civilized man suffers, is—to put the Fusion Party into office.

The Power of the Trusts

Now, what are the facts relating to industrial unrest, the high cost of living, and the operations and power of trusts and combines?

When we were before the electors in 1910, we pointed out the increasing powers of what are known as trusts and combines. During the last three years many convincing proofs have been given as to the influence of these great organizations of capital and of the world-wide scope of their operations.

Although in Australia these combinations have not, perhaps, reached the stage of development that they have in other countries—notably in the United States—their existence and power are manifested in almost every part of the commonwealth. That state of things in which individual traders and manufacturers competed against one another, and the consumer obtained the goods at the lowest price compatible with a fair and reasonable profit, has completely disappeared in many if not in most lines. There is, of course, keen competition amongst retailers, but the prices at which retailers sell to the public are naturally governed by the prices at which they can buy of the wholesale merchants. And in most cases wholesale prices are fixed by arrangement either by these merchants or by the greater organizations who really control the output and distribution of the goods.

Exorbitant Profits and High Prices

It therefore follows that the prices the people pay for most of the things they eat, drink, wear, and use are not “competitive prices,” but fixed and arranged prices; and as those who fix or arrange these prices are concerned chiefly with getting exorbitant profit, these prices are not “fair and reasonable,” but are considerably higher than would be the case under free competition.

This is only natural. When a few practically control the output and distribution of any article which the people must have, they are in a position to fix the highest price that the

people can possibly pay. The only limit, therefore, to the prices fixed by combines and "honorable understandings" is the limit of the people's purse. If the trusts charged more, the people could not buy. The combine seldom charges less than the very most that the unfortunate consumer can pay. This is the present position of the people, not only in the commonwealth, but throughout the world. It is a position which, on the face of it, is quite incompatible with democratic government. Theoretically, freedom of trade and freedom of access to opportunities are open to all, practically, where a few men with a tremendous amount of capital control the means by which modern production and distribution must necessarily be carried on, the rest of mankind can only live upon sufferance.

Control of Trusts

The present position is intolerable. The interests of the people must be protected, and the policy of the Labor Party is to take whatever steps are necessary to protect them. . . . We are not opposed to combination. We believe indeed that combination is infinitely better than cutthroat competition, provided that the interests of the people are properly safeguarded. But to allow a few individuals to control the production and distribution of the necessities of life, to fix what price the people must pay for what they must have, is to place the whole community at the mercy of the few. Combination makes for efficient and economical production. Properly controlled, it is a benefit to the community. Uncontrolled, it is a menace to the liberties and the very existence of democracy.

Cost of Living and Industrial Unrest

These are the facts, and they are indisputable, yet in the face of them the Fusion says that the Labor Party is responsible for the industrial unrest and the high cost of living. Such a statement is an insult to the intelligence of the electors. Let us prove it. Australia is the only country in the world where the Labor Party is in power and in office.

But industrial unrest is world-wide. There is not one civilized country where it has not manifested itself during recent years. In Great Britain, America, France, Germany, Austria, and Italy,

upheavals—compared to which those in Australia appear quite insignificant—have taken place in the last three years.

The Cause

The same may be said of the high cost of living. This, too, is a world-wide phenomenon. To say, as the Fusion Party does, that the Labor Party is responsible for it, is an audacious and willful misrepresentation of facts. The cost of living in the United States is 16 per cent higher than in Australia, but there are no wages boards in that country, and no Labor Party in office or power. And the same is true of Great Britain, where the cost of living has, according to the board of trade returns, gone up to such an extent that what cost 20 shillings in 1909 costs 23 shillings in 1912. The Fusion Party insults the intelligence of the electors by declaring that high wages are the cause of high prices. The exact opposite is true. The people must live, and to live their wages must be sufficient to purchase the necessaries of civilized life. High prices cause and compel a demand for higher wages. The endeavor to enforce the demand causes industrial unrest.

High Prices

Only in Australia is the Labor Party in office. Only here and in New Zealand are there arbitration courts and boards for fixing wages. But in every country trusts and combines control the means of production. In every country they regulate output, they fix prices, they exploit the people. And in America, where they are most powerful, the cost of living is higher than in any other country. We have tracked the thing down. It is obvious that the main cause of the increased cost of living is the exorbitant profits extracted from the people by the trusts, and the immediate cause of industrial unrest arises out of the increasingly difficult struggles of the people to make both ends meet.

Amendment of the Constitution

In order to control trusts, combines, corporations, and great monopolies, which now exploit the public, and to deal with industrial unrest and the high cost of living, amendment of the constitution is imperatively necessary. Without such amendment it is futile to attempt to deal with these great questions.

At present the Commonwealth is for all practical purposes powerless. In order, therefore, that these great questions may be effectively dealt with, the amendments of the constitution now before the people must be made. . . .

Reasons for Amendment

We have not space here to repeat the arguments there set forth. But briefly, the reasons why the electors should vote for the six amendments are as follows:

Our constitution, which is copied from the American, gives us the same powers over trusts, industrial and other cognate matters as that of the United States. It leaves the states the same powers as the United States Constitution leaves the states of America. In America, after 20 years of the best efforts to deal with trusts by federal and state laws, the position, as stated by Senator Chauncey Depew, one of the most notable American statesmen of our day, is:

“There are ten men in the city of New York who can in 24 hours STOP EVERY WHEEL OF ALL THE RAILWAYS, CLOSE EVERY FACTORY, LOCK EVERY SWITCH ON EVERY TELEGRAPH LINE, SHUT DOWN EVERY COAL MINE AND IRON MINE IN THE UNITED STATES. What a travesty on the declaration that this is the government of the people, by the people, for the people, when TEN MEN CAN MAKE STARVING BEGGARS OF 100,000,000 people in 24 hours.”

Present Constitution

The net result of all this legislation—the most drastic possible under constitutions like ours, and that of America, is that the trusts after 20 years of it are the most numerous and powerful in the world, and control not only the industrial, but also the commercial, financial, and political lives of the American people. The laws, both state and federal, have been enforced in many cases, and a great number of convictions have followed. But the trusts laugh at convictions and grow fat upon them. The Standard Oil Trust, for example, was only recently convicted, heavily fined, and solemnly dissolved by the Supreme Court of America. This ought to have been the end of the trust, but its power to exploit the world is not lessened. To-day it is as strong as ever, and Rockefeller and a few of the great shareholders have made £40,000,000 as a direct result of the conviction!

The fact is that while the constitution remains as it is, no power exists either in America or here that can cope with trusts. State laws cannot do it, and the federal arm is cramped.

.

Protect the People

Every federation in the world, except America, has these powers. Canada has and always has had them. In the face of these facts, why should the people of Australia hesitate to take these powers, the lack of which has placed America under the heel of the trusts to such an extent that, to repeat the words of Senator Chauncey Depew, "Ten men can make starving beggars of 100,000,000 people in 24 hours."

.

Proposed Amendments

1. Control of Trusts.—And now, having stated the issues before the electors and the necessity for amending the constitution, we come to the policy of the Labor Party for the next Parliament. If the proposed amendments are carried we shall pass legislation to control trusts and combines in the public interest, and to create machinery for reviewing and, where necessary, regulating prices in cases where effective competition does not insure a fair and reasonable price to the consumer.

The Fusion says that the regulation of prices is impossible. But regulation of prices by the trusts in their own interests is the dominant feature of our age. Why should public regulation of prices in the interests of the people be impossible? It is not impossible, and it is absolutely necessary. Those who know most about the matter strongly favor it.

ANDREW CARNEGIE, of the great American Steel Trust, says: "Granted combination, THERE MUST BE REGULATION, and as no judge the world over is allowed to sit in judgment in a case in which he is personally interested, so NO PRODUCER CAN EVER BE JUDGE OF PRICES. It follows, then, that an industrial court must be formed WHICH SHALL FIX THE MAXIMUM PRICES, that the consumer may be protected against extortion." And EX-PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT says: "THIS CONTROL (OVER TRUSTS) SHOULD, IF

NECESSARY, BE PUSHED IN EXTREME CASES TO THE POINT OF EXERCISING CONTROL OVER MONOPOLY PRICES, as rates on railways are now controlled."

2. Nationalization of Monopolies.—With regard to monopolies, these will be generally dealt with in the same way as trusts and combines. The broad principle upon which legislation will be based is that where the welfare of the people demands it, the law will exercise a vigilant supervision over the operations of these great organizations of capital. We shall make provision to prevent individual traders and manufacturers being crushed out by combines or attempted monopolies. We shall protect the public by regulating prices where these are exorbitant. Where the interest of the Commonwealth can in no other way be protected, we shall exercise the powers given by the amendment of the constitution and nationalize the monopoly.

3. General Company Law.—We shall pass a General Company Law designed to encourage legitimate trading and prevent unfair trading, and to protect the interests of shareholders and the public. At present there is no power to pass such a law, and yet no legislation is more badly needed.

New Protection

We shall introduce at an early date such legislation as may be necessary to give effect to the policy of the new protection. As there is some room for doubt as to what new protection is, we here set forth what it means. Unlike the old protection, the benefits of the new protection are not to rest wholly with the manufacturer, but are to extend to the workman and the consumer. The workman is to get a fair and reasonable wage and decent conditions of labor. Where the State Wages Boards give him these, well and good. Where they do not, federal courts will do so. And the consumer is to be protected against exorbitant prices. In this way protection becomes a national policy in the true sense of the term, and is not, as at present, mainly confined to one comparatively small section of the community. The manufacturers of Australia are entitled to protection against unfair competition; they are entitled to a fair and legitimate profit; they are entitled to settled industrial conditions. These things we shall endeavor to secure for them, but they are not entitled to exploit the workmen or the general public, and we

shall therefore pass such legislation as will, while protecting Australian manufacturers, also protect the community.

Industrial Peace

The present industrial powers of the Commonwealth are quite inadequate. It cannot prevent industrial disputes. It cannot deal with them when they arise unless they extend beyond the limits of any one state. And it is absolutely powerless to deal with the most common form in which great industrial disputes extending beyond the limits of one state occur. The "sympathetic strike"—the most dangerous and affecting the greatest number of people—is, in nine cases out of ten, beyond its jurisdiction. The cause of such a strike may be the demand of a union inside a state. With that dispute the Federal Conciliation Court cannot deal. But until it is settled, the "sympathetic strike" of unions outside the state cannot be settled. The arm of the federal court is tied. It cannot act when action would be most likely to prove effective. It must sit down supinely and watch the trouble become more and more serious, extending from one small center until it envelops the whole state, and still do nothing. Not until the dispute reaches such a stage as to make settlement an almost impossible task can the federal court interfere.

This is not only absurd, but a deadly menace to the best interests of the community. If industrial peace is worth having we ought not to tie the hands of the court created to maintain it.

The facts and the best authorities on the Fusion side both support our contention that the constitution ought to be amended so that the Commonwealth's powers may be such as to preserve the industrial peace of the community.

If these amendments are approved by the people, we shall clothe the Federal Arbitration Court with power to prevent disputes, to deal effectively with such disputes as do arise, wherever and in whatever circumstances they may arise, if state courts cannot or do not do so. For this purpose we shall make provision for subsidiary industrial tribunals, wherever and whenever the circumstances call for them.

.

The Fusion and the Farmer

It is said also that the Commonwealth will take over the railways. This is, of course, a downright untruth, as those who make the statement know full well. The amendments do not give the Commonwealth power to take over the state railways. They do not even give power to deal with state trade and commerce carried on state railways. They do not give the Commonwealth any more power to fix freights and fares than it has now. So much for that audacious attempt to mislead the electors!

The Fusion, in its usual fashion, attempts to save its friends, "the great trusts," by endeavoring to frighten the small farmer and storekeeper and make them fight its battles. Before the 1910 election the Fusion, at the instance of the great landlords of Australia, dreading the progressive land tax, told the farmer that the effect of the land tax would be to ruin him. They said that the £5,000 exemption was only an election cry, and that if we got in we would take it out and tax the small man. Time has nailed those lies to the wall. The £5,000 exemption remains, and we again pledge ourselves not to remove it during the next Parliament.

The Fusion says, first, that the proposal to fix prices is absurd, and second, that the Labor Party will fix the prices of the produce of "the man on the land" and the goods of the retail storekeeper. Such a statement is utterly untrue. Like the land tax lie, it is a cunning attempt by the monopolists and great vested interests to save themselves.

We have already said that we shall not attempt public regulation of prices, except where these are regulated by trusts, combines, monopolies, rings, or "honorable understandings." We shall not attempt to regulate prices received by "the man on the land" for his produce. It is not by the farmer that the public is squeezed, but by those to whom the farmer sells his produce.

The farmer is squeezed by the freight ring and by other rings. We shall endeavor to protect him.

Nationalization

The Fusion says that, if the electors approve of the sixth proposed amendment, the Labor Party will at once nationalize every industry in the country! That ~~it~~ will nationalize every

small storekeeper, and that even "the poor widow" in her tiny little store will be taken over by the Federal Government! Such statements are not only gross misrepresentations, but are plainly absurd.

It is not the small storekeeper, or the widow in her little store, that menaces the welfare of the people, but the great monopoly which holds the community in its ruthless grasp. When one company or combine has destroyed all its competitors, it has the community at its mercy. When, as is the case with more than one combine here, it controls the production, manufacture, and sale of something which the people must have, a state of things exists which is incompatible with free government, and cannot be tolerated. It is to deal with such great monopolies that this amendment of the constitution is required. And it is absolutely necessary.

WE SHALL NOT NATIONALIZE THE SMALL SHOPKEEPER, OR THE BIG SHOPKEEPER EITHER. This is not a remedy to be applied to retail traders amongst whom competition insures fair profits, and fair profits only. But it is for use, and if we are returned and this amendment is carried, we shall use it against those great monopolies whose exactions are unendurable, if regulation of their operations cannot be effected in any other way.

.

Initiative and Referendum

True democratic government demands that the people's will, continuously ascertained and expressed, shall be supreme, but representative government does not, in many cases, permit the people to make their desires known or to see that their desires are given effect to. At the election of a Parliament the people really rule; during the intervals between elections their power is confined to criticisms, and to such means of approaching Parliament as are afforded by petitions, public meetings, and the columns of the press. Generally Parliament responds to public opinion thus manifested—but not always. Besides, public control in this way is not only uncertain but indefinite, and entirely unsanctioned by the law; and Parliament can, if it chooses, wholly disregard it. What is wanted is a means by which the people may, in a clearly defined and legal way, express their disapproval of any legislation proposed or passed by Parliament, and initiate

such other legislation as circumstances in their opinion warrant. In this way the people's control over Parliament would be continuous. They could veto such legislation as was objectionable, and compel attention to matters of great importance which might arise between elections, and upon which the Parliaments had not been instructed.

Protection and Defense

Protection is the settled policy of the country. The Labor Party, therefore, will take such steps as are necessary to make that policy effective, and will at an early date bring down such amendments of the present tariff as will protect the manufacturers and producers of the Commonwealth against unfair outside competition.

As the fiscal question is not included in the platform of the Labor Party, the views of members of the party have been ascertained. It has been found that the great majority of members support the promise given by the prime minister at Maryborough on March 31 to bring down a scheme of effective protection.

Believing as we do that customs duties for revenue are no part of the policy of protection, and therefore should be made as light as possible, we propose to reduce such duties on the necessities of life imported from other countries.

Our policy of national defense, military and naval, has been already stated by the prime minister at Maryborough. That policy we shall resolutely and energetically carry out. Everything necessary to Australia's defense and to make her contribution towards imperial defense a real and effective one will be done.

We shall prosecute with diligence and energy a policy of national development. The settlement and development of the Northern Territory will be pushed on with. The construction of the Transcontinental Railway will be energetically carried on. A vigorous policy of railway construction will be undertaken. We believe in Australia and in her greatness, and shall do all that is possible to hasten her development.

Insurance

We shall pass a general insurance law, regulating the operations of all insurance companies. The measure introduced last

session broadly indicates the lines along which we think such a law should proceed. It is much needed, and we shall place it on the statute book at an early date.

In addition to regulating the operations of private insurance companies, we shall establish a commonwealth insurance department, controlled and guaranteed and carried on by the Government. It will be based upon sound business lines, and will engage in all kinds of insurance business. The operations of the New Zealand Government Insurance Department have been most successful, and not only does the institution show a good margin of profit, but the exorbitant rates charged by private insurance companies—more particularly for fire insurance—have been greatly reduced through government competition. There is ample justification for the establishment of a similar institution here, and we shall take steps to do so as soon as possible.

.

A Great National Policy

Here then is our policy. It deals with those great issues now compelling the attention of the whole civilized world. And it goes right down to bedrock. It is a policy for the whole people, and not only for a privileged few. It is a policy of action, put forward by men who have proved by their record that they are men of action and true to their pledges. It is a great national policy that will develop the best that is in Australia—a policy that will protect our country from dangers within and without.

With full confidence in the justice and patriotism of the Australian people, we invite them to attach to it the seal of their approval.

ANDREW FISHER,

Commonwealth Offices, Melbourne.

D. WATKINS, Plattsburg,

Secretary Federal Labor Party.

8. SOCIALIST OPINION ON ELECTION OF 1913

a. *From Vorwaerts (Berlin)*

“A noteworthy feature of this election campaign was the great bitterness with which it was fought and the

sharp class lines that appeared on the surface during the struggle. The Labor Party lost a large number of its middle-class and farmer supporters, elements that have hitherto been a hindrance to the party movement. About one-half of the seats of the Labor Party won in the last election (1910) were gained in the farming and country districts, territory that had no industrial population worth mentioning. About one-half of these seats were lost in the recent election. On the other hand, the industrial proletariat stood solidly behind the Labor Party. They put up a hard fight against the well-organized onslaught of the Liberals with their powerful press.

“In a country with such great distances, as is the case in Australia, newspaper agitation must naturally play a very important part. The labor press of Australia is still in its infancy, while the Democratic organs, which formerly supported the Labor Party, became very uneasy over its new collectivist policy and edged away from this dangerous movement. This was true, for instance, of the *Melbourne Age*, a paper that, in 1910, was to no small degree responsible for our success in Victoria and Tasmania. This paper, too, has become afraid of the so-called extreme elements that have taken hold in the Labor Party. Moreover, the better class is still haunted by the memory of recent strikes. It looks with distaste upon the Fisher Ministry, with its friendly attitude toward the labor movement. It cannot forget that this ministry, in January of the previous year, refused to send out troops against the striking street car employees in Brisbane when it had been requested to do so by the Liberal state administration of Queensland.

“Besides, the wealthier class generally felt that the collectivist principles of the Labor Party were ceasing to be a dead letter in its program and that it would now proceed

without ceremony to abolish all constitutional hindrances to the success of its aims. It proposed to begin a general nationalization of industries with the creation of a national steamship mail service between Tasmania and the mainland. . . .

“The Labor Party, on the other hand, can point out real achievements for the social and cultural life of the nation. Only last year it created a maternity pension, providing for the payment of five pounds to every woman who gives birth to a child. It has opened up the northern territory and has taken the first steps toward the building of a great railroad that shall cross Australia from east to west. If it has not accomplished more along the line of social and industrial reform, constitutional restrictions, not the party itself, are to blame.”

b. *W. C. Anderson, in leading article of The Labor Leader*

“With two points in Australian policy we do not agree, but we frankly admit that Australia has its own problems, and the solution of them may be safely intrusted to the Australian workers themselves without undue outside interference. The Australian workers believe that their economic position would be made worse by Chinese and Japanese immigration, and this explains their strong plea for a ‘White’ Australia, and their apparently harsh attitude toward colored races. Many of them believe also in the possibility of military invasion by the yellow races, and that is the real explanation of their attitude toward conscription and national defense. Nevertheless, on the question of national defense, the Australian Labor Party has indorsed a policy which would not be supported by the international movement. In Australia itself there is a large volume of Socialist opinion opposed to conscription,

and this feeling is certain to grow. At the same time, it may be admitted that there is less aggression in the arming of Australia than of any other country." . . .

c. *Article by Alf. James, The Socialist (Melbourne)*

"The whole economic forces of the country are divided, politically, into two opposing camps; although a bill may be modified in its scope through the activities of various interests once a measure is put to a division, there can be only a straight vote—yes or no. Before the entry of labor into the arena of politics, the two great representative parties were the landowners and certain financiers, in opposition to the industrial employers.

"In Australia the rapid rise of the Labor Party has compelled these (in relation to each other) antagonistic forces to unite against the small producers and wage-laborers.

"With the advance of capitalism, the petty bourgeoisie is being inevitably crushed out of existence.

"This process, while every year rendering labor's spouse, the middle class, still more withered and decrepit, increases overwhelmingly the numbers of the proletariat, and, by the establishment of larger industries, provides for their more effective union, both politically and industrially.

"Only as this change is effected can the wage-workers tighten their hold on the government, and whether they remain in political alliance with the small traders, or maintain an attitude of no compromise, their progress must be equally limited; but it is obviously much more to the immediate interests of the proletariat to secure what amelioration it can by means of such an alliance than to allow the big capitalists to have complete control of the political machine. It is, therefore, necessary that every

worker, no matter how extreme his views, should do his utmost inside the Labor Party to force the hands of the middle class. . . .”

9. ELECTION MANIFESTO OF THE AUSTRALIAN LABOR PARTY, 1914

Labor's Program

The program of the Labor Party has already been declared by Mr. Fisher at Bundaberg. To that program—which sets forth in clear and unambiguous terms the policy of labor, including its attitude towards trusts and combines, amendment of the constitution, initiative and referendum, tariff, industrial and social legislation, labor stands pledged for the next Parliament. If returned with a majority, we shall, without other delay than that imposed by urgent measures necessary for the protection of the Commonwealth during the war, give effect to that policy.

There follows at this point a statement of the Labor Party's position on war already printed in Mr. Walling's volume, *The Socialists and the War*.

The manifesto then continues:

Thus far we have dealt with the direct consequences of war. But the effects of modern war are not confined within the narrow limits of days gone by. The world to-day is so interdependent; its nervous system of finance, commerce, and industry so co-related and so exquisitely sensitive that war between any two great nations threatens the whole industrial life of the modern world with instant paralysis. It was this great danger with which we were threatened in Australia.

It needs no words to show the consequences of unemployment on so huge a scale as must surely follow upon the heels of modern war. These would be in their extent far more serious than the direct consequences of war itself. Yet they could in no way be averted unless there were at the hands of the authorities the means whereby credit—the basis of modern industrial and commercial activity—could be so reinforced as to enable it, despite this tremendous shock, to stand firm.

The conference at which representatives of the Opposition sat

with those of the Government and the states has made such arrangements, and it was enabled to do so because the Commonwealth Bank and the Australian Note Issue had created the very instruments by which credit could be supported and the wheels of industry kept moving even in this great crisis.

Thanks then to the Australian Note Issue, enough money is to be loaned to the states by the Commonwealth to enable them to maintain their public works policy and thus prevent a huge army of unemployed being thrown upon the streets. Similarly with private employment. Had it not been for the Commonwealth Bank and the Note Issue, the private banks would have been compelled in sheer defense to restrict credit; overdrafts would have had to be reduced; enterprises affected by the war would have shrunk almost to nothing. Money would have been very dear; unemployment and trade crises would have come upon us like a flood, submerging everything. Instead of which, money is very cheap; employment is encouraged; traders should not be called upon to reduce overdrafts or harassed by dread of complete ruin. The wheels of industry move and trade becomes possible.

The Commonwealth Bank and the Australian Note Issue, without which at this juncture we should be faced with a general collapse of industry, trade, and finance, are due to the Labor Party alone. By their fruits shall ye know them.

Words cannot express the difference between things as they are now and as they would have been if the Labor Party had not taken these steps to defend Australia from invasion and from the consequences of war.

The Issue for the Electors

Here, then, fellow-electors, is the position. War has come upon us, but thanks to the Labor Party has not found us unprepared. It would be idle to pretend that we can hope to escape some of the consequences of war; but two things are clear, viz., "That owing to the Labor Party's policy, Australia is able not only to meet the situation calmly itself, but also to relieve the Empire of the burden of defending these shores and the adjacent waters and to actively support her at the seat of war.

The electors have to choose a new Parliament. That means they have to decide upon whom they shall rely to govern the

country during this great crisis. Upon whom will their choice fall?

The choice lies between two parties—the Labor Party, who foresaw and provided against war and all its disastrous consequences; and the present government, who denounced every one of those measures without which to-day Australia would be an object of derision to the outside world, a burden to the mother country, and a humiliation to herself.

We forbear to criticise the policy of the present government since its accession to office. But in defense matters it has done nothing, and has left undone very much that ought to have been done. True to its invariable policy, it has talked but it has not acted.

This is the hour when men of action should be at the helm. And the men who created the defense forces of Australia, who are familiar with the every detail of their organization, are on the face of it the men who may be relied on to make the best possible use of them.

Fellow-electors: Here is the position. We leave it with all confidence for you to determine.

ANDREW FISHER.

DAVID WATKINS,

Secretary.

Federal Parliament House, Melbourne.

10. ELECTION CAMPAIGN OF 1914—LEGISLATIVE ACHIEVEMENTS OF LABOR PARTY *

“A brief summary of the principal measures which the Labor Party has placed on the Commonwealth statute book will not be amiss at this juncture. It is a fine record, and one which would have been increased in many important directions were it not for the unfortunate technical limitations of the constitution, which, as interpreted by the High Court, prevented the National Legislature turning its attention upon subjects that properly should come within its scope.

* *The Brisbane Worker*, August 20, 1914.

“Further, the monument of legislative activity and constructive statesmanship piled up in the past is a pledge of what the party is prepared to do when again the opportunity is given it in the future.”

1908 (First Fisher Ministry)

Australian industries were encouraged by the Manufacturers Encouragement Act, 1908, providing for the payment of bounties on the manufacture of iron, steel, wire-netting, and wire within the Commonwealth on certain terms, including a provision making the payment of fair and reasonable wages a condition precedent to payment of the bounty.

1910 (Second Fisher Ministry—Three Years' Term)

LAND TAX, for the purpose of splitting up large estates and helping the smaller man.

POSTAL RATES ACT, introducing the system of penny postage, now so widely appreciated.

AUSTRALIAN NOTES ACT, providing a commonwealth note issue and financially strengthening the Government.

NAVAL LOAN REPEAL ACT, repealing the ridiculous Loan Act of the previous Fusion Ministry which was passed for the purpose of borrowing £3,500,000 from Cohen in order to construct a navy. Labor paid for the navy out of revenue, established a sound principle, and saved interest charges.

DEFENSE ACT, providing for a citizen soldiery, small arms factories, military clothing factories, etc. The benefits of this measure are specially appreciated now.

1911 Session

Establishment of COMMONWEALTH BANK, i.e., the bank of the nation. Commercial tranquillity and trade confidence in the present crisis is very largely due to the existence of this nation-backed institution. . . .

1912 Session

MATERNITY ALLOWANCE ACT, so helpful to the mothers of Australia.

The comprehensive NAVIGATION BILL FINALLY PASSED. It is the largest measure yet passed by the Federal Parliament.

INTERSTATE COMMISSION ACT. The commission is now in full swing, and doing good preliminary work in bringing to light strange commercial customs.

COMMONWEALTH WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT.

AMENDMENT OF INVALID AND OLD-AGE PENSIONS ACT, liberalizing the principal act in a number of ways, chief of which was the abolishing of any deduction on account of the value of a home of a pensioner who resides in his own home.

AMENDING IMMIGRATION ACT in the direction of better protecting, by means of medical inspection, the Commonwealth from undesirable immigrants.

REPEAL OF SUGAR EXCISE AND BOUNTY ACT in the interests of the sugar industry.

Extending the benefits for a further period of two years of the MANUFACTURES ENCOURAGEMENT ACT OF 1908. Also extending for five years the assistance of the BOUNTIES ACT of 1907 on the following goods: Flax and hemp, jute, linseed, rice (uncleaned), tobacco leaf, and fruits, dried or candied, and exported; and for a period of two years from 1st January, 1914, the bounties granted on combed wool and tops exported.

.

11. THE FUTURE OF THE LABOR PARTY

(Editorial in *The New Statesman*, September 12, 1914)

The question now is whether, the Liberal Party having disappeared, labor can provide the qualities necessary for successful progress along the lines already begun. This is doubtful; and one's doubt is increased by reading the recent policy speech of Mr. Fisher, the labor leader. Summarized, his proposals are:

1. The establishment of a commonwealth line of steamers.
2. Increased protection.
3. Initiative and referendum.
4. Australian navy constructed locally and financed out of revenue.
5. Uniform railway gauge.
6. Dominions reciprocity.
7. Improvement of arbitration court procedure.
8. Vague remedies for increased cost of living.

9. Pensions for widows and orphans.
10. Payment of cadets for work on holidays.
11. Superannuation scheme for public service.
12. Grants for investigation and treatment of consumption, cancer, and syphilis.
13. Commonwealth insurance department.
14. Vague measure to cope with trusts and monopolies.

Such a program shows an appreciation of the point of view of the average elector which amounts to genius, but it is a curious production for a Socialist Party in the twentieth century. Observe how social and industrial problems are overlooked. It is true that the rejection of the referenda, by which labor sought extended powers, impairs the scope of the labor platform, but a "stand-pat" attitude on industrial questions is not desirable. The fact is that labor is not tackling the problems which previous Liberal-Labor legislation has raised. This legislation cannot be regarded as a complete solution of social difficulties. Its virtue is that by disclosing nearer and more subtle problems it brings us closer to the real issues which have to be faced before a solution is arrived at. . . .

It is to be feared that we have reached a stage in which the Labor Party regards it as more important that it should hold the reins of power than that it should trouble itself with a host of problems of great complexity. The man of advanced views can afford now to pass the Labor Party and look to what will supersede it with a more virile and up-to-date set of ideas. At a time when the utility of political machinery is being challenged no class of people is less likely than the Australian worker to be content with a "stand-pat" party. It was not as a party of prudence but as a propagandist idealist body that the Labor Party achieved success, and if it abandons this side of its efforts it is not likely to remain useful or trusted. The Australian loves change and recognizes no vested interest in the existing order. Any definite and intelligent attempt at social readjustment would secure support.

II. FROM THE AUSTRALIAN SOCIALIST PARTY REPORT TO THE PROPOSED INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST CONGRESS TO HAVE BEEN HELD AT VIENNA IN 1914

Until quite recently Australia depended mostly upon primary products for the income and profits of its owners, the capitalist class. Now, however, the development of the factory system is taking place with increasing rapidity; and according to some figures just compiled by the government statistician of New South Wales—the oldest and leading state of the Commonwealth—the number of factories and employees are increasing out of all proportion to the increase of population. The land monopolist in the country has, in addition to the old system of rack-renting, established a system of share-farming, under which he takes in good seasons anything from one-third of the farmer's crop upwards. This system of peonage is having its effect in forcing men off the land into the towns and cities, to swell the number of factory employees and the army of unemployed in each state.

According to the N. S. W. statistician's figures, wages in the factories have risen nine per cent, which works out at about £5 per head, but the cost of living has gone up more than twenty per cent, so that the workers have suffered a serious reduction. The rents workers have to pay astonish those who come from older lands, and have risen so rapidly during the last two years that the overcrowding in the slums has become a scandal and disgrace.

Meanwhile, governments—both Liberal and Labor—are scouring the globe for more people. Lying advertisements are widely circulated in Europe to induce innocent people to come to this country, who, when they arrive, are sadly disillusioned by finding the class struggle more bitterly waged than they thought could be possible.

To attract population, the various state governments advertise widely certain advantages which labor is alleged to possess. One of these is the industrial legislation of the country, which is said to be the most up to date and most favorable to the workers of any legislation in the world. Part of this claim is founded upon our system of arbitration, which was specially designed to do away with strikes and industrial unrest.

In each of the six states of the Commonwealth arbitration courts and wages boards exist for the settlement of industrial disputes, and if such a dispute spreads from one state to another there is a federal arbitration court to which the parties to the dispute may be summoned.

Originally industrial arbitration was advocated and popularized by the Political Labor Party, and it took several years before it could be passed into law. The employing class were very suspicious of it, but once it became law they saw how it benefited them, and they are now quite enthusiastic in its support. Socialists warned the workers from the first that arbitration courts and wages boards would fail to affect the class struggle in a way that would be beneficial to them. The majority still fail to see this, but there are more strikes than ever, which justifies our contention and proves that our warning was timely.

Wages boards are presided over by a chairman, who is generally either a lawyer or a member of the employing class appointed by the state government. Before this chairman, who often has no practical knowledge, an equal number of working-class and capitalist representatives argue the dispute and produce evidence. When the cost of living goes up, the board usually recognizes the fact, and makes an award in favor of increased wages. This is done after much forensic fighting and expenditure of unionist money, and the result in most cases could have been arrived at by the workers themselves with solidarity and proper organization.

When an award has been made strikes and lockouts become illegal, and many workers have been fined for striking. When fines are inflicted upon the workers they are recoverable by the state by means of the garnishee. The workers are not imprisoned for non-payment of fines, but when they recommence work their wages are confiscated to pay the fines and costs. The garnishee was invented by the New South Wales Labor Government, and was quickly adopted by the Liberal governments of other states.

Besides providing for the garnishee, the Industrial Arbitration Act makes it a penal offense to advocate a strike or to assist those on strike with monetary or other material support. The authorities may take drastic steps to break a strike. They may enter a unionist meeting hall and seize the union's books and papers, and in the last great coal strike the government seized

trainloads of coal which the miners had taken from a mine they had rented.

But with all its drastic features, industrial arbitration is a failure, and the Labor politicians are directing the workers to make an attack on trusts and combines as the cause of rising prices and industrial unrest. *They have failed to make wages boards raise wages as the cost of living rose, so are aiming to bring the cost of living down by an attack on prices.* (Our italics.)

In this sham fight against the trusts the Federal Labor Party leads the way. . . . During its term of office the Federal Labor Party administered the class state on lines laid down by previous capitalist governments, and even went further in some directions than any other capitalist government would dare to go. The result was that last year it was hurled from office by a small majority. It had lost the big majority of three years previously, and a good deal of the confidence of its own supporters.

There are many causes that contributed to the downfall of the Labor Party, but one or two main ones need only be mentioned here. As soon as they found themselves in power members of the party commenced to win the confidence of the small employers and traders, a class which is notoriously ignorant, loyal, and grasping.

Perhaps the pledging of the conscript forces to assist in foreign aggression did more to disillusion many than anything else. The party as a whole had been led to believe that the conscripts were only to be used for home defense and the maintenance of a white Australia, yet the leaders had pledged their support to the imperial expansionists.

When the labor leaders returned from the coronation celebrations there was a marked change in them. The aristocrats had done their work, and probably the armament firms had not been without their influence. Orders were placed for battleships and an era of military and naval activity entered upon.

Recent strikes in England, New Zealand, and South Africa, where all available forces were used to defeat the workers, have tended to decrease the belief in conscription, and at the Federal Labor Conference, and also in the Federal Senate, attempts have been made to so amend the act that the conscripts could not be used for strike-breaking purposes.

The objective of the Labor Party has, since its inception,

undergone a gradual but definite modification. It appears now to be aiming at state capitalism. Money is being freely borrowed from European financiers with which to start state enterprises, the profits from which are to be spent to pay interest on loans and to build a navy and an army to defend the financiers' interests. A sham fight against trusts and combines is maintained.

An attack in the courts upon the coal combine was prosecuted even to the Privy Council in England, where it was, of course, defeated by the very interests on trial.

Most of the trades-unions of Australia have hitherto been affiliated with the Political Labor League which selects the parliamentary candidates and frames the platform. The league has been practically captured by the small capitalists and employers, whose leaders are inveterate boodlers and men on the make. Several have signified their political successes by building palatial mansions in fashionable quarters and by aping the manners, customs, and style of the ordinary capitalist snobocracy. This is having a marked effect on many unionists, some of whom are rushing into anarchist and other anti-political organizations in opposition to the P. L. L. A significant disposition on the part of a more moderate section in the unions has been a recent attempt at the formation of a trade-union political party, which should exclude employers and small capitalists from parliamentary representation. Another fact, significant of the declining faith in the old P. L. L. leaders, has been the opposition to the levy struck by unions to found a daily paper.

The Australasian Socialist Party is opposed to every form of militarism, and refuses to draw the color line. Its organ, *The International Socialist*, has fought both the capitalist and laborite press on these matters, and a good deal of educational work has been done in union circles by its articles and consistent attack.

A false impression has been created abroad by the capitalist press, which constantly refers to the Labor Party as a Socialist Party. The Labor Party is not a Socialist Party. It is really a Liberal Party, and stands for much the same as the Liberal Party of Great Britain does. It stands for a big navy and for land taxation, just as Liberals like Lloyd-George and Winston Churchill do. It stands for a loan policy and a huge charge for interest, just as both the old parties in Britain do. It fathered

and adheres to conscription just as firmly as the National Service League does in Britain, and in this respect is more conservative than British Liberals are. It rejects the class struggle and claims to represent all classes, but never neglects to side with the employers in industrial conflicts. Its objective is really state capitalism. There is not a member of the Socialist Party in any Parliament in the Commonwealth. Socialists who have contested elections as Socialists have always been defeated. . . .

(See also "Militarism," "Compulsory Arbitration," "Immigration," and "The Race Question.")

CHAPTER XXIII

NEW ZEALAND

I. INTRODUCTORY

(From *The New Statesman*, 1914)

“In New Zealand, until recently, Liberal-Labor ideals were dominant, and there was no effective independent labor force, such as existed in Australia. In 1912, under the guidance of an able American Socialist, Mr. W. T. Mills, the United Labor Party was formed, consisting of the affiliated trades-councils and Labor Party branches and unions, a close combination in effect of trade-union and ‘reformist’ Socialists, with an organization and a policy resembling that of our own Labor Party. But outside this stood, on the one hand, the syndicalistic Federation of Labor, covering a large section of the trade-unions, and, on the other, the Social Democratic Party, with an extreme anti-reformist policy, and friendly to the Federation of Labor. Last July, however, a conference was held, at which the Federation of Labor and the S. D. P. split the United Labor Party in twain, and carried with them the majority of its supporters, including Mr. Mills himself. The new party, with its double organization, the Federation of Labor, pursuing a militant policy on the industrial side, and the S. D. P. as its equally militant political complement, may be a powerful force in the future, though it is too early yet to pass any judgment on it. But, in any case, it is an interesting example of reversion from the British to the German model.”

1. THE FOUNDATION OF THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY

(From articles in *The New Statesman* [1913] by Edward Tregear, for many years chief of the Labor Department of New Zealand and now president of the new party.)

“It is fortunate for the purposes of this article that the world-wide attention given to New Zealand’s ‘progressive legislation’ on social and economic subjects prevents the necessity of a prologue of a semi-historical character. There is no need to refer more than briefly to a period of more than four or five years ago. At that time the political position was, roughly, as follows: a Liberal Ministry, the successor (in an unbroken line) of the ‘Liberal and Labor’ Ministry of 20 years ago, occupied the seats of power. An Opposition Party, formed originally under the auspices of the squatter or large landholder class, had made a stubborn but unavailing fight against the Liberal ascendancy through all those years, but latterly with growing hope because its supporters saw that with the continued prosperity of the country they had gained many Liberal friends who, though still voting against the freeholder class for appearance’ sake, were in their hearts eager for the distinction of being among the landed gentry and the ‘squires’ of the rural districts. The fate of these two political parties should have depended entirely on the way in which the workers (always the huge majority in a ‘one man, one vote’ community) threw their support electorally, but practically the workers’ vote was disregarded. Dissensions among themselves neutralized the weight of their influence, and it was usual among election agents to treat the labor vote as a negligible quantity. The worker voted, as in England, not for his mate but for his master.

“The causes of dissension among the workers were, as elsewhere, many and intricate to dissect. Among these

were ignorance of economics, distrust of one another's motives, unforgiving remembrance of harsh words hastily spoken, haziness of schemes for improvement, different strata of wages and of craft-skill, and want of sympathy wrought by diversity of occupation. Added to these were local causes of misunderstanding, *dissatisfaction with awards of the Arbitration Court, disagreement on the very principle of industrial arbitration*, railings at the support or non-support of striking unions, personal irritation against particular ministers and officials, etc., etc. At last the unrest took actual form and materialized. The Miners' Federation took the wider name of the Federation of Labor, and invited other unions to join what was generally considered to be a syndicalist organization frankly avowing that it stood for 'the Industrial Revolution.' On the other hand, the formation of the 'One Great Union' was met by the institution of 'The United Labor Party,' composed of the old craft-unions federated into trade-groups—such as building trades, transportation trades, etc.—with a central executive. The Federation of Labor gathered into its bosom the coal-miners, gold-miners, shearers, wharf-laborers, and many unions of unskilled labor, altogether about 10,000 strong. The old trade-councils with such unions of skilled trades as engineers, carpenters, plumbers, tailors, shop-assistants, etc., joined the United Labor Party, numbering about 30,000 souls. At first there was little but friendly rivalry between these two labor organizations, but they broke out into open war over the strike at the Waihi Gold Mine in the North Island.

"Just previous to this time, however, a general election had been held. The workers had slowly but surely become disaffected towards the continuous Liberal Ministry. The famous old 'Liberal and Labor Party' of 1890 that had

swept the Tories into obscurity had gradually forgotten its origin, and its control had fallen with advancing years into the hands of wealthy and powerful commercial men. Labor considered that its interests were neglected and those of its antagonists fostered. Moreover, a new generation had arisen which knew nothing of the old grinding pressure of the Tory heel. So, partly from sheer love of change, partly in payment for neglect of their interests, thousands of worker votes were cast against the Liberal Government, with the effect that the Tories, who now called themselves—with tongue in cheek—the ‘Reform Party,’ by a chance found themselves with a number of members in the House of Representatives nearly equal to that of the Liberals. It was but by a chance, for less than 36 per cent of the votes actually cast at the polls were for Tory candidates, and so narrow was the margin of majority votes in some of the electorates that a paltry 300 votes, if distributed, would have secured the Liberals 12 more seats, thus giving them a clear working majority once more. The support of three Labor members kept the Liberals from utter defeat and in power (under the Hon. T. Mackenzie, now High Commissioner for New Zealand in London) for a few months, but the ‘ratting’ of four members elected as Liberals completed the party’s downfall, and allowed the pseudo ‘Reform’ Government to take charge for the present of our political affairs. The Tories are in power, and practically on the labor vote!

“While attention had been generally centered for some time on political matters, the Waihi strike had assumed a formidable aspect, on account not of the spreading of the trouble, but of its feverish excitement. For 17 weeks Waihi was the scene of picketings, union processions, hootings, boycotts, and, without doubt, open intimidation of those persons opposed to the methods of the Federation of

Labor. The trouble had arisen through the Waihi Miners' Union—some 1,300 strong—which had canceled its registration under the Arbitration Act, attempting to retain in its membership a small body of mining engine-drivers that wished to break away and register under the act. So the miners sent an ultimatum to the manager of the mine, saying, in effect, that if these men were retained they would 'down tools.' It will be seen later on that this decision was based on a more important point of interest to all unionists than the mere announcement of such an arbitrary demand seemed at first to warrant. At all events, the United Labor Party thought that it was simply a determined attempt to injure a union which was trying to register under the Arbitration Act. As support of the principle of industrial arbitration was one of the tenets of the United Labor Party, that party not only refused financial aid to the strikers, but one of its branches, on being applied to by an Australian trade-council for advice, declined to advise Australians to subscribe to the strike funds. This caused intense bitterness, and the Labor Party was assailed in excited terms for its 'dog-in-the-manger' policy, and its want of fraternal sympathy when help was needed.

"The management of the Waihi mine had during the 17 weeks of turmoil obtained some 'free labor' to work the mine; it was very poor stuff, a few miners and a large assortment of 'toughs' and the riff-raff of a mining town. These, on attempting to open and work the mine, were provided with a daily escort of abusive men and screaming women. At last the Government moved in earnest to abate the scandal and supplied the police protection that should have been furnished weeks before. The strike leaders, to the number of about 40, were sent to jail in Auckland, not for what they had done, but because they would not

find security that in future they would keep the peace. When these men were removed, the galled strike-breakers, under police protection, turned on their tormentors, and the disorder broke into open anarchy. The Miners' Union hall was stormed, one of its defenders killed by a policeman who had been fired at, the strikers were ordered out of Waihi, hunted into the scrub on the hills, their families given 24 hours' notice to leave the place. All this was done by the strike-breakers, not by the police; so at last 'order was restored.' . . .

"The immense importance of these events was at once recognized by industrial unions and trade-unions all over the country. The United Labor Party sniffed danger on the wind and began to reconsider its position towards the Federation. The peril lay in a direction which may not be perceived at once outside New Zealand, so I will explain. The Arbitration Act had never been made compulsory; only those unions which decided to register were accepted; and, afterwards, if a union was dissatisfied it could apply for cancellation and again have its freedom. Here, however, were two powerful unions—Waihi and Huntly—which had renounced the act, endangered by the registration of two small unions, for only registered unions were acknowledged by industrial law as existent. An agreement drawn up between the small union and its employers (the union probably fostered and 'owned' by the employers) could fix prices, hours, etc., for *all* persons working at that occupation in the whole industrial district, so that the large majority of unionists were practically at the mercy of a few of their own recalcitrant members. To howl 'scab!' or 'blackleg!' at the small union is futile, and the liberty conceded when the Arbitration Act was established has melted into thin air. The command to unions now practically is: 'Arbitrate or die!'

“A conference of trade-unions was called by the Federation of Labor in January last. About a hundred delegates, representing 30,000 men, attended. Among these were representatives of unions belonging to the Federation and the United Labor Party, and of unions unaffiliated to either. After the Conference opened, the executives of the United Labor Party and of the Socialist Party were invited to send delegates; four delegates (of whom I was one) from these bodies attended. . . . The Conference resolved that, although no pledge binding on any union was to be made, each delegate should use his most strenuous efforts to induce his union to agree (1) to stop abuse and forget all cause of former offense, so that for six months there should be truce and alliance; (2) to send delegates to a congress in July, at which the present constitutions of the United Labor Party, the Federation of Labor, and the Socialist Party should be merged and one constitution to which all should agree—if possible—should be adopted. In order to have a common line of pre-discussion among unions, a unity committee was set up which drafted the sketch of a possible organization, its industrial side to be called the United Federation of Labor, its political side to be named the Social Democratic Party. The Conference dissolved, but the Unity Committee entered on a campaign to capture all unions before the session of the Congress in July.

“The response was enthusiastic, and the efforts of the movers are meeting with hearty response. Organizers were out in all directions, speaking in public halls and at street corners, passing from town to town, distributing literature and forming committees. Trade-councils, craft-unions, federations of trades, affiliated and unaffiliated unions joined and sent in funds for propaganda work. Our objective was plainly enough stated, as follows: ‘The socialization of the collectively used means of production, dis-

tribution, and exchange.' The Tory Government of this Dominion recognizes fully and openly two things: first, that it has nothing to fear just now from the Liberal Party; next, that it has much to fear from the Labor Party if the rift hitherto dividing our forces can be closed. One of the ministers lately said as much in a public speech—viz., that the only safety of the 'Reform Party was to keep the workers divided.' . . .

"On July 1 the Congress assembled. It consisted of 380 delegates, representing over 50,000 persons; the largest labor congress ever held in Australia. The sittings occupied ten days, and resulted in the formation of 'The United Federation of Labor' and of 'The Social Democratic Party.' . . .

"The principal issue of the deliberations was the formation of two bodies, one exclusively industrial and the other entirely political, yet so interwoven and interdependent that they possess common interests and give mutual support. The industrial body, the United Federation of Labor, consists of local trade-unions arranged in ten departments. One of these is called the Building Trades Department. To this carpenters, masons, bricklayers, painters, etc., belong. Another is the Transportation Trades Department, including seamen, drivers, railway servants, tramway men, etc. In similar manner the whole industrial world is arranged and systematized. Each of these departments elects one member of the central executive, but the president and chief officials are elected annually by direct vote of the whole Federation. The purpose of the Federation is boldly and unflinchingly stated. It is to 'bring about a co-operative commonwealth based upon industrial democracy.' " . . .

2. PROGRAM OF THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY

(Adopted June, 1913)

Socialization of the means of production, distribution, and exchange.

Universal woman suffrage (instead of the present limited franchise).

Proportional representation.

The initiative and referendum.

The recall of elected persons.

The right to work.

A legal minimum wage.

A legal six-hour day.

Voluntary (instead of compulsory) submission of the unions to the arbitration courts.

Representation of the workingmen on the administrative bodies of all governmental industries.

The building of commercial ships by the state.

State insurance against death, accidents, sickness, and fires.

Old-age pensions of £32 for all women of 50 and all men of 60 who have lived 15 years in the country.

Substitution for compulsory military service of voluntary organizations with democratic administration, which cannot be used in labor disputes.

II. THE ELECTIONS OF 1914 *

1. REVIEW AND FORECAST

By Edward Tregear

“The next general election in New Zealand, taking place at the end of this year [1914], promises scenes of unprecedented excitement. The cause of this political turmoil is the determined effort of the wealthy Tory Party to keep in power and rule the democracy with what the victors call ‘firmness’ and the victims call ‘a rod of iron.’ Much of the rancor felt against the government arises from

* *The New Statesman*, August, 8, 1914.

the belief that its members have no right to the seats of power, having only gained that position by the 'ratting' of men who were elected to oppose them; also that the votes cast at the last general election for the Tories were scarcely one-third of the total votes polled. Not only this, but the autocratic suppression of the Wellington Wharf strike by armed force and by vindictive sentences on the advocates of the strike caused intense feeling in the towns, while the general failure of the Tories to keep when in power the pledges they made before election strengthens the bitter opposition to their continuance of rule. They promised to reduce taxation; the taxation per capita has greatly increased. They pledged themselves to curtail applications to the British money market for loans; they have borrowed more heavily than any of their predecessors. They engaged to give labor a 'square deal'; and the country worker was 'sooled' on to the workers in the cities. By harsh use of their small majority in the House they have taken the control of the Civil Service from a Parliament triennially elected, and handed it over for seven years to commissioners appointed by themselves. They have given the freehold tenure to men who acquired leases of land on the distinct understanding that the land was public property, and could not be parted with except on lease. They have partially destroyed the good understanding formerly existing with the British Admiralty by advocating a separate navy consisting of a little cruiser with which to guard the Pacific, but nevertheless the scheme is pregnant with a promise of smothering taxation in the future in order to keep up in 'the race of armaments.' They have destroyed the second ballot in favor of the old rotten system of 'the first past the post' at elections, in the hope that the Liberals and the Labor men may split votes, and so let the Tory in. These are not a tenth part of the

complaints which are brought against the existing government as the record of its short time of office.

“Against these indictments must be considered the probable support of the rural districts to a party which has shown itself inimical at every point to the citizens of towns. Many of the farmers are now aware of the deception practiced on them to induce the celebrated ‘cowboy raid’ at the time of the strike last December, and know that they were deluded into helping the shipping ring to maintain high freights and low wages. Nevertheless, the farmers not only shipped their butter in time to receive the highest prices in the London market, but they also received a subsidy of £100,000 in ‘wages’ as special police called in to load their own goods on to the ocean liners. This extra donation from the pockets of the general taxpayer naturally put the recipients into good humor towards their Tory benefactors. Then there is also ‘the country quota’—of which, perhaps, English people are unaware. It gives an advantage of 28 per cent to a rural over an urban constituency. Thus 3,000 men in the country have a representative, against over 4,000 in a town—Heaven knows why; perhaps because in days when the country was sparsely settled and communication difficult the dwellers in the wilds needed an advantage that at present is unfair. It tells strongly in the composition of Parliament, and gives the farmer, whose isolation always tends towards reaction, a preference for Tory methods and undue weight in carrying them out. . . .”

2. QUESTIONS FOR PARLIAMENTARY CANDIDATES PROPOSED BY SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY, 1914

Will the speaker explain the following, and state whether or not he will work and vote for their adoption if returned to Parliament:

- (1) The initiative and referendum on proper petition;
- (2) The right of recall of all elective officers;
- (3) Proportional representation, to apply to the whole dominion;
- (4) Abolition of the country quota;
- (5) The repeal of the penal clauses of Massey's "Industrial Disputes Investigation Act," and the abolition of fines and imprisonment for refusal to work or for giving support to those on strike;
- (6) The right of the workers to organize their own unions independent of employers, and to federate their own unions into a national federation of their own, just as the employers themselves are already organized, and thus making bogus unions of labor impossible;
- (7) National provision of employment for all able-bodied unemployed, under standard conditions prevailing;
- (8) The restoration of the legal industrial rights taken from the workers by Massey's "Police Offenses Amendment Act, 1913," and so placing the New Zealand workingman on the same legal footing as is guaranteed to British workers;
- (9) If you intend supporting any of these measures in the future, what have you done for any of them in the past?

3. THE LABOR REPRESENTATION COMMITTEE

(From *The Maoriland Worker*, November 4, 1914)

"The Social Democrats in Wellington, convinced that in all political matters the workers must not be deprived by any committee of leaders of the right to select both constituencies and candidates, and therefore unable to act in conjunction with the newly formed Labor Representation Committee, have nevertheless considerably strengthened their own position by giving solid proof of their desire to avert any clash with other bodies claiming to represent labor. The withdrawal of the Social Democratic candidates in Wellington East and Wellington Central now leaves the field in those electorates, as well as in Wellington South and Wellington Suburbs, to the candidates of the L. R. C.

The Social Democrats will fight the strongest of labor's enemies in the north. Although we have disagreed with the L. R. C.'s methods, we would urge every worker in the constituencies affected to rally to the support of the L. R. C. candidates. We want to see the Massey Government defeated; we want to see every possible representative of labor returned to the new Parliament. All our differences may be discussed and thrashed out when the election is over. In the face of the common foe, our duty is working-class solidarity."

4. THE RESULTS OF THE ELECTION, 1914

(From *The Maoriland Worker*, December 16, 1914)

"Even if the Massey Party [the Tory or Governmental Party] should succeed in retaining office, it will not be by the wish of the people but in defiance of the majority of the people. The returns (exclusive of absentees and expeditionaries [sent to the war]) give the following results:

Labor	51,088
Liberals	204,294
	<hr/>
	255,382
Tories	226,795
	<hr/>
Anti-Tory majority	28,587

"So that by a majority of nearly 30,000 the people of New Zealand have recorded their condemnation of Tory rule. Had the elections been decided under a true system of proportional representation there would have been no possibility of the Massey Party retaining office and the power to do further harm.

"The North Island gave the Tories a majority, the figures being: Tories, 134,409; Liberals, 110,697; Labor, 28,129.

"The South Island was overwhelming in its defeat of the

Tories, who received 92,386 votes as against 93,607 cast for the Liberals, and 22,959 for the Social Democratic and Labor candidates.

“There were nine official candidates contesting seats under the auspices of the Social Democratic Party, and these polled an aggregate of 21,457, equal to 2,384 votes per candidate.

“Two candidates were put forward under the joint auspices of the Social Democratic Party and the Dunedin Trades and Labor Council, and they polled a total of 7,677 votes.

“In Wellington the Labor Representation Committee had three candidates, who polled a combined Liberal and Labor vote of 10,167.

“Other Labor candidates . . . indorsed by purely local Labor bodies polled 10,609 votes.

“Four others who ran as ‘Labor’ candidates without any organization behind them polled an aggregate of 1,178 votes.

“An analysis of the Social Democratic and Labor voting gives the following results:

Social Democratic Party.....	21,457
Social Democratic Party and Dunedin Trades and Labor Council	7,677
Wellington Labor Representation Committee (La- bor and Liberal vote).....	10,167
Other Labor candidates	10,609
Independent Labor candidates	1,178

Social Democratic and Labor total.....51,088
(See also “The General Strike.”)

CHAPTER XXIV

SOUTH AFRICA

I. INTRODUCTORY

ONLY about one-fourth of the population of the recently formed Commonwealth of South Africa is European, 4,700,000 out of its 6,000,000 population being colored. As the colored, and especially the full-blooded Negroes, are barred by law from becoming miners or engineers, and are excluded by custom from most other skilled occupations, the labor movement has been almost exclusively among the white and the skilled.

II. THE LABOR PARTY AND ELECTIONS OF 1913

Soon after the formation of the new state from the Transvaal, the Orange Free State, Natal, and the Cape Colony, the Labor Party was founded. At the elections of 1910 it elected 4 of the 121 members of Parliament (a number later raised to 5) and secured a strong representation in the municipal governments of Johannesburg and Pretoria.

Following the great railway and general strike of 1913, the party made some far more remarkable gains, portending a strong Labor Party influence in the next Parliament. In a by-election in the Cape Colony, the Labor candidate secured 1,298 votes against a total vote of 811 for his two opponents. In the elections for the Provincial Council of the Cape Colony, Abdul Abdurahman, the Labor Party

candidate, was elected by a large majority and the Labor vote increased throughout the colony.

But the greatest victory was in the Transvaal, where the strike had centered. Here the Provincial Government fell completely into the hands of the Labor Party, a result all the more remarkable as little over half of the Council were voted upon at this election.

The House is composed of 45 members, and there were 25 to elect, of which number the Labor Party captured 23 seats and the Conservatives 2. The popular vote was: Labor, 26,108; Conservative, 12,305; Nationalist, 3,029, and about 1,500 scattering. The figures show that some of the most prominent politicians and military officers who stood for election to the House suffered the most crushing defeat. In several instances laboring men were voted out of jail and into the legislature with large majorities.

The dispatch in *The Daily Citizen* (London) attributed this sweeping victory to the following causes:

The interference of the Randlords, the dragooning of the masses by Botha and Smuts, the terrible Peace Preservation Bill, the desire to oust white labor and to substitute cheap, servile, and inefficient labor, and, last but far from least, the deportations.

All of these factors were dealt with above in connection with the general strike of 1913—which was as much a political as an economic crisis.

(See also Immigration and the Race Question and Government Ownership.)

SECTION V

SOCIALISM IN CHINA

CHAPTER XXV

CHINA

I. INTRODUCTORY

THE Socialist Party in China, as in Japan, is illegal. It is, therefore, impossible to give any accurate idea of its strength or recent development. Moreover, since the practical abolition of constitutional government by Yuan Shi Kai, the Parliament has ceased to be a parliament in fact, and it is therefore impossible even to estimate the Socialist vote.

Nevertheless, during the brief existence of a constitutional Parliament, there were two movements in China that interest us: one, a definitely Socialistic Party, the other the movement headed by Sun Yat Sen, representing ideals and a program similar to those of the labor parties recognized as Socialistic by the International Socialist Congresses and the Reformist wings of the Socialist Parties in many countries.

We therefore give an authoritative account of these movements, especially because of the future importance of China.

II. AN INTERVIEW WITH SUN YAT SEN

By Kannibelle in Japan, October 9, 1913

(Published in *The New York Call*, June 28, 1914)

[Dr. Sun, the first President of China, is regarded by himself and many others as a Socialist. His position is similar in many points to that of the Australian Labor Party or the Russian Labor group.]

“A political revolution is a necessary initial step toward an economic and industrial revolution. . . . In constitutional countries the revolution will be attained through education and evolution; these are bloodless revolutions. . . .

“The trouble in China is economic. It is between the landless, starving millions and the landed interests, who, for fear of the ire of the people, have thrown themselves into the arms of the foreign capitalists. But after the establishment of a constitution and the overthrow of Yuan Shi Kai, the newest revolution, however, needs no blood. . . .

“Some people have construed this secondary revolution as the inauguration of Socialism. . . .

“Socialism in China is known as *Shay kwei choo yee*, which in English means ‘the theory of humanitarianism.’ This policy, which defied the usurped authority of Yuan Shi Kai, is the policy of the southern patriots, who aim at equality, universal love, and peace. This policy demands mutual aid, the abolition of the old ‘class’ system, and pledges itself to guarantee the abolition of poverty as well as extreme wealth. . . .

“Therefore, Socialism is the only method of serving our politico-economic problems. . . .

“I know that industrialism is necessary in China; the

march of civilization is too insistent to be stayed, and it must come to China. We must develop our resources, and the development of them provides food for serious thought. I want to avoid what seems to be the natural corollary of advanced modern capitalism—the unfair treatment of the toiler. And when I look around me for a solution I find none has yet been found by foreign countries.

“In our virgin country there is opportunity to begin rightly, and I am convinced that we should strive in every way so to meet the advance of industrialism that the worst features of it should be prevented from ever taking root. Therefore, I advocate Socialism. And what do I mean by that? I shall work in the future, as I have been working in the past, for the introduction of a system whereby the creators of wealth, the labor, will be able to receive its fair share of the production, and this must be based upon a common ground of justice and fraternity. By this system production would be enhanced and increased to the maximum, with a minimum of poverty and labor slavery. All men would have their proportion of the products of the wealth now awaiting development at their hands; they would reap the full fruit of their toil, secure favorable conditions of labor, and obtain opportunity in leisure to think of other things than the daily grind in the mill or the mine. They would be able to cultivate the mind, have adequate recreation, and procure the blessings which should be in all men’s lives, but which, on the showing of other nations, are largely denied the workers and the poorer masses.

“A chance would be given to all in the race for a livelihood in life, and the fullest measure of liberty should be provided. This is what I will fight to establish in China.

“When I urge Socialism, or a Socialistic system of government, I urge a system which will create for the people

of China a direct interest in the vital affairs of their whole country; consequently it will create a more virile and worthy patriotism. I want to see the great multitudes of my country participate in the results of the productiveness of the country that is their own, and this is what I mean by nationalism.

"I also want to see that the state derives the fullest value from the sources of revenue which should be under its immediate control. I advocate state ownership of railways, tramways, electric light power, gas-works, canals, and forests. I want to see royalties coming to the state from mines and revenues from the land. . . .

"The revenue derived from all these avenues will constitute a sum greatly in excess of what will be needed for state administration, and the balance may be used in the necessary work of education and the more charitable and desirable objects, such as the old-age pension, the care of the lame and the blind. . . .

"The Kuo Mang Tang, the Nationalist Party in China, is in charge of these various political principles; its success or failure depends upon its members. It is powerful throughout the entire country, especially in the east and in the south. Its influence is extensive and is rich in resources. Numerous publications, banks, and other great industrial associations are supporting this party. Almost all the merchants who consider themselves enlightened are its members.

"From America it derives its greatest moral and mental weapons. From America the student class brings liberal and enlightened economic and political ideas, while from his curio shop or from his laundry the Chinese Nationalist forwards his voluntary contribution for the enhancement of this 'theory of humanitarianism.'

"Thirteen out of 22 provincial governors are its mem-

bers. Thirteen or more local legislatures are therefore under its control. . . . Out of a total of 880 members in the new Parliament, 446 are Nationalists, while the political unionists, the Yuan Shi Kai partisans, number 120; the rest are Republicans, under Li Yuan Hung; the Democrats, under Kang Liang, and the Independents. The Yuan Shi Kai régime at first tried to unite his faction with the rest of the factions in opposition to the Nationalist Party. Those he could not persuade he bought over, while he succeeded in exterminating many members of the Nationalist Party in the Parliament until he attained the necessary majority to perpetuate himself in power.

“These are the facts regarding the rebellion of the South and the East. No, there will never be true peace and tranquillity in China until the country’s politico-economic problems are solved ‘by and through selective judgment of the people of China.’

“My country is awakening and is awakening fast for one which has been in a stupor for many centuries. She will soon take her place and demand respect among the greatest nations of the world. Yuan Shi Kai may retard her progress, but he cannot thwart her steady advance indefinitely.”

III. SOCIALISM IN CHINA

By Kiang Kang Hu

(In *The Masses*, October, 1914)

“The forcible dissolution of the Socialist Party of China a year ago by order of the military dictator, Yuan Shi Kai, attracted little attention in the American press. It was a party that had grown up so swiftly that even the Socialists of America hardly knew of its existence, let alone of its power and influence.

“Yet it was so large and powerful as to arouse the fear of the despot, Yuan Shi Kai, and to call for the most bloody methods of suppression. The mere facts will astonish anyone not acquainted with the nature of the Chinese people, as revealed by recent history.

“In 1911 the first Socialist group was formed, and the first Socialist paper started. In three months, under the impetus of the First Revolution, the movement spread all over China. . . . Several Socialists had been elected to the Parliament of the newly established republic at Peking, and Socialist measures had been introduced.* There were in existence more than 50 Socialist newspapers. Socialist free public schools had been established, a Socialist trade-union organized, a woman’s auxiliary started, and immense quantities of leaflets and pamphlets distributed. Most curiously Chinese of all, Socialist theatrical organizations were touring the country from end to end with Socialist plays.

“In view of these facts, which only one who has seen the tremendous development of revolutionary ideas in China recently can well believe, it is not strange that the bloody hand of Yuan Shi Kai should have fallen on the Socialist movement. That the despot took the movement seriously is shown by the decree of dissolution which he issued August 8, 1913:

“The Socialist Party of China is using the cloak of a political party in order to conceal its evil designs. These demagogues would coerce the Government and flatter the people for their own evil ends. They are a danger to peace and law and order. They advocate violence and assassination. Therefore they have incurred the displeasure not only of the Government but of the

* Chang Chi, President of the first Senate, was a Socialist, educated in Paris and a friend of Jaurès. Ma Su, Sun Yat Sun’s secretary, editor of the daily *China Republican* the principal revolutionary newspaper (in English), and many others were Socialists.

people as well. Many letters have been received from officers of Tien Tsin, Peking, and elsewhere, warning us against Socialist plots and conspiracies. Many foreign anarchists have joined them in order to disturb the international peace. The Socialist Party of China is not like the Socialists of other countries, who merely study Socialism. If we do not put an end to their activities a great outburst will follow.

"Therefore we have issued this decree calling upon the provincial governments and generals to dissolve the Socialist Party of China wherever found, and to arrest the leaders.

"Thus law and order can be preserved.

"YUAN SHI KAI,

"President of the Republic.

"The decree was carried out. Everywhere the branches of the Socialist Party were forcibly broken up by troops, their treasuries confiscated, and their leaders arrested and executed. Not only that, but the homes and places of business of those known to be members of the Socialist Party were looted or confiscated.

"The national headquarters of the party alone escaped, being located in English Town, Shanghai. But the whole fabric of the organization was effectually, for the time being, destroyed.

"In order to make it clear how such an organization as this could come to exist in China, it is necessary to understand two things. One is that in China the propaganda of such doctrines as Republicanism and Revolutionism come with all the tremendous blasting power of the New. The Chinese have not been inoculated against these ideas. The Chinese mind in the first years of this century was virgin soil.

"The other thing to understand is that the sentiment of Communism is very strong in China, having lasted from primitive times in the form of various customs and institutions. And industrially China is still in the handicraft

stage of production: Capitalism has not yet brought in the philosophy of individualism as it has in the Western world. So the idea of the common ownership of the means of production is no strange and curious conception to the people of China. They do not have to overcome a century of capitalist education before they can believe in Socialism.

“In the last decade there had been scattered here and there in small groups throughout the Empire a few people who studied and advocated Humanitarianism, Communism, and Socialism. These groups, however, had no connection with each other, and their ideas were, for the most part, vague and misty. But they furnished, in a few cases, an impetus for the starting of radical newspapers. These newspapers had as their purpose the introduction of new ideas into the country.

“Chief among the methods of introducing new ideas was the translation of Western authors. There were thus published in Chinese portions of the writings of Balzac and Victor Hugo, of Byron and Shelley, of Dickens and Mark Twain, of Goethe and Heine, and, later on, of Kropotkin, Marx, Engels, and Bebel.

“The revolutionary ideas of these poets and writers served to educate the readers of these newspapers, and incidentally their editors. I, Kiang Kang Hu, was an editor of one of these papers, being at the same time instructor in the University of Peking. Coming in contact with the doctrine of Socialism in this way, I became interested, and finally converted. Especially did I admire and value the master-work of August Bebel, *Woman Under Socialism*. So profoundly did it influence me that I began an agitation for the establishment of schools for women—a thing which had been undreamed of before in China. The agitation was successful, and many schools were set up.

“Full of this idea, I went in June, 1911, on a lecturing

tour through the Che Kiang province, speaking on *Woman and the Socialist Movement*. This speech was issued in pamphlet form and had a tremendous circulation. Then the storm of official displeasure broke over me. The viceroy of the province ordered my arrest. My newspaper and pamphlet were confiscated, and with due solemnity publicly burned. I, disguised as a porter, escaped to English Town, Shanghai, where I was safe from arrest. This was the first instance on record of the prosecution of a Socialist in China.

“It was also the beginning of the Socialist movement. On July 10, 1911, I organized a Socialist club in Shanghai, and on the same day the *Socialist Star*, the first Socialist paper in China, made its appearance.

“This Socialist Club of Shanghai was originally organized more to study Socialism than to propagate it. About 50 men and women were members of the group, and earnestly they studied the Socialist classics.

“But meanwhile, the First Revolution had started in the South, at Hankow. On November 3, 1911, Shanghai fell into the hands of the revolutionists. Then the club changed its name to the Socialist Party of China, and organizers were sent out into the southern provinces, where many new branches were organized. The *Socialist Star* became a daily, and had a wide circulation. The party membership increased with enormous rapidity. *The Shi Hui Tong, or Socialist Party, was the first political party as such in China.* On November 5, 1911, it met in its first annual convention at Shanghai and adopted a platform.

“These Socialists, though not clear Marxists, having so recently been drawn into the movement, were nevertheless enthusiastically in earnest in their desire to establish a Socialist republic. They declared in their preamble for the common ownership of the land and the means of pro-

duction, and then adopted the following eight planks as a working platform:

"1. The establishment of a Republican form of government. . . .

"2. The wiping out of all racial differences. . . .

"3. The abolition of all the remaining forms of feudal slavery and the establishment of the principle of equality before the law. . . .

"4. The abolition of all hereditary estates. (China has a vast agricultural population, which suffers under absentee landlordism. . . . The agrarian question is one of the greatest problems in China to-day.)

"5. A free and universal school system, on co-educational lines, together with free text-books and the feeding of school children. (The great bulk of the people of China cannot read and write. There are as yet no public schools.) . . .

"6. The abolition of all titles and estates. . . .

"7. The abolition of the army and navy.

"This platform was used by the 30 Socialists elected to the first Parliament at Peking as their working program. They introduced into Parliament a measure for equal, direct, and secret suffrage; a measure for the establishment of public schools; a measure for the abolition of all personal taxes. A measure to create an inheritance tax; a measure to abolish capital punishment; a measure to reduce the standing army; a measure to abolish girl slavery. None of these measures came up for a final vote, for before that time the Parliament had been dissolved by the soldiers of Yuan Shi Kai.

"The party had by this time over four hundred branches in China, each with its official teachers and readers—for a great part of the membership could not read. Agitators and organizers, most of them working without pay, were sent out broadcast. The party owned its own printing plant, and published three official papers, the *Daily Socialist Star*, the

Weekly Socialist Bulletin, and the *Monthly Official Bulletin*. Among the pamphlets and leaflets which were printed at this plant and sent out in great quantities, one of the most popular was 'The Communist Manifesto.' In addition, many branches printed their own local papers, and at one time there were over 50 of these in existence. Then, too, there were between 10 and 15 privately owned papers which supported the Socialist Party. The extreme left of the Young China Association leaned strongly toward the party, and the columns of many Young China papers were open to the Socialists.

"The most important of the free public schools established by the party was situated at Nanking. This school had an attendance of over eight hundred. Free public kindergartens were also established by the party.

"A very curious part of the party organization was the Socialist Opera and Orchestra Company. In China, actors and musicians are very low caste. After the First Revolution, many of these joined the party, and the party organized them into several theatrical companies, which toured the country, playing symbolical Socialist plays, and proving themselves an invaluable adjunct to the party propaganda.

"The woman's organization had for its main work the furthering of the agitation for woman's suffrage. This organization had at one time close to one thousand members, and in addition many women belonged directly to the party itself. Schools for women were started by the party, and had a large attendance.

"In addition, the party collected funds for the sufferers in the famine districts, and in other places where there was need.

"Meanwhile, an anarchist movement had grown up in China. Some of the anarchists joined the Socialist Party

and sought to foist their views upon it. These two hostile schools of thought came to open battle at the second annual convention of the party. Finding themselves in a hopelessly small minority, the anarchists split off and formed the 'Pure Socialist Party.' . . .

"The 'Pure Socialist Party' and other anarchist groups did much to discredit the Socialist Party of China. People confused one with the other, and when the reaction set in, the Government craftily used this confusion to further its ends.

"Already during the second year of its existence, the Socialist Party was meeting with bitter opposition, . . . not only from the Government, but also from the Republicans and the Constitutional Monarchists. Nevertheless, the party continued to grow.

"But Yuan Shi Kai was now extending his power and strengthening his army, with the intention of making his despotism secure. One by one the Republicans were skillfully worked out of place and power. Finally Song Chi Ying, one of the leaders of the Young China Association, who had raised a voice of suspicion against Yuan Shi Kai, was assassinated, and though there was no direct proof, it was believed by all that the assassin had been paid to do his work by Yuan Shi Kai. The despot in the meantime had borrowed great sums of money from the foreign banks, without consulting Parliament, as the constitution provided, and was using this money to strengthen his position.

"All during the months of March and April, 1913, the Socialist Party held gigantic mass meetings all over the country, at which they exposed the duplicity of the Provisional President, Yuan Shi Kai. Manifestos were issued calling upon him to resign. Yuan Shi Kai now surrounded the House of Parliament with troops, gave 'presents' to

many of the representatives, and was almost unanimously elected President of China.

“In July, 1913, the southern provinces, tardily awakening to the danger of the situation, rose against Yuan Shi Kai. It was too late. The Second Revolution, after two months of sanguinary fighting in Shanghai, Nanking, and elsewhere, was drowned in blood.

“Parliament was dissolved and new elections ordered. All pretense of political freedom disappeared. The Young China Association was outlawed. The decree against the Socialist Party was issued. Everywhere the heads of Socialists and Republicans rolled in the dust.

“The Socialist Party of China, as a party, has ceased to exist. Most of the leaders of the organization, those who have not paid with their heads for their loyalty to the working-class, have gone to foreign countries, where they are busy collecting money and laying plans for a new revolution. And in China itself the work is being carried on in secret by methods which cannot, at this time, be discussed. Suffice it to say that several brave comrades have already lost their lives in the hazardous work.

“But there will be a Third Revolution, and the Socialist Party will again take its place in the Red International.”

PART II

THE SOCIALIST PARTIES AND SOCIAL
PROBLEMS

CHAPTER I

THE SOCIALIST PARTIES AND THE LABOR UNIONS

THE International Socialist Congress at Zurich, in 1893, resolved, by a vote of 16 national parties against 2 (Spain and France), that all labor unions "which recognized the necessity of working-class organization and political action" should be admitted to the International Congresses. As a consequence, from this date (1893) the International movement has been based as much upon those labor unions which recognize the importance of independent political action along labor-union lines as upon the Socialist parties themselves. Moreover, the relative importance of this Labor Party, or political labor-union, tendency has increased from year to year.

The International Socialist Congresses no longer claim to consist exclusively of Socialists. In 1907 and 1910, at Stuttgart and Copenhagen, the British Labor Party, which declares itself a *non-Socialist* political organization representing the labor unions in politics, was admitted to the Congress and given five out of the ten votes allotted to British *political* organizations (the Independent Labor Party being given two votes, the Social Democratic Federation two votes, and the Fabian Society one vote).

But this is not all. Besides this indirect representation, the British labor unions were given a direct representation of 10 votes, thus receiving 15 out of the 20 votes allotted to Great Britain. Moreover, the Fabian Society and the Inde-

pendent Labor Party are minority branches of the British Labor Party. At the Congress of Stuttgart a vote was refused to the Australian Socialist Party because it was not a member of the non-Socialist Labor Party of that country,—although the latter organization had not even asked for admission to the International Congress.

In every country, with the exception of the United States and the British colonies, the relation between the Socialist parties (or the Labor parties, where there are any such) and the labor unions are most intimate. In some countries the Socialist parties seem in some measure to dominate the unions; in others the unions appear in some measure to dominate the political organization.

I. THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF STUTTGART, 1907

All the Socialist parties of the world, with the exception of the French, and including even a minority of that party, were able to come to an agreement at the International Congress at Stuttgart as to their relation to the labor unions. This agreement was as follows:

To enfranchise the proletariat completely from the bonds of intellectual, political, and economic serfdom, the political and economic struggle are alike necessary. *If the activity of the Socialist Party is exercised more especially in the domain of the political struggle of the proletariat, that of the unions displays itself in the domain of the economic struggle of the workers.* The unions and the party have equally an important part to perform in the struggle for proletarian emancipation. Each of the two organizations has its distinct domain, defined by its nature and within whose borders it should enjoy independent control of its lines of action. But there is an ever-widening domain in the proletarian struggle of the classes in which they can only reap advantages by concerted action and by co-operation between the party and trade-unions.

As a consequence, the proletarian struggle will be carried on more successfully and with more important results if the relations between the unions and the party are strengthened without infringing upon the necessary unity of the trade-unions.

The Congress declares that it is to the interest of the working-class in every country that close and permanent relations should be established between the unions and the party.

It is the duty of the party and of the trade-unions to render moral support the one to the other, and to make use only of those means which may help forward the emancipation of the proletariat. When divergent opinions arise between the two organizations as to the suitableness of certain tactics, they should arrive at an agreement by discussion.

The unions will not fully perform their duty in the struggle for the emancipation of the workers unless a thoroughly Socialist spirit inspires their policy. It is the duty of the party to help the unions in their work of raising the workers and of ameliorating their social conditions. In its parliamentary action the party must vigorously support the demands of the unions. (*Our italics.*)

II. THE CONGRESS OF THE FRENCH PARTY

The resolution of the International Congress at Stuttgart (above quoted) was passed on the supposition that the labor unions could not work *directly* for Socialism, but only through the Socialist parties, which are presented as the political expression of labor unionism. The French Socialists give an even more important function to the labor unions; they are to work directly for Socialism on the economic field, and their work is to be recognized by the Socialist parties as being quite as important as the work done by these parties on the political field. The French proposed to the Stuttgart Congress—in accord with this view—the resolution they had just passed at their national Congress at Nancy. Though this resolution did not receive the support of any of the other nations, it

has since been steadily reaffirmed by the French. We therefore quote its chief passages:

The Congress is convinced that the working-class will achieve its full emancipation only by the combined power of political action and labor-union action, extending even to the general strike, and by the conquest of the entire political power, to the end of the general expropriation of capitalism;

It is convinced that this twofold action will be efficacious in proportion as the political organization and the economic organization possess full autonomy, *unionism having the same aim as Socialism*:

It believes that this fundamental agreement of political action and economic action of the working-class will necessarily assure, without confusion, or subordination, or defiance, a free co-operation between the two organizations. (Our italics.)

III. THE CONGRESS OF THE FRENCH PARTY, 1912

The French Party Congress of 1912 again discussed the question of its relation to the labor unions at length, and ended by the reaffirmation of the position taken at Nancy, as above given. A summary of the 1912 discussion is of importance as showing the friendly attitude of the Socialists towards "Syndicalism" in the country of its birth, and demonstrating that France furnishes no exception to the rule that Socialist parties and labor unions are everywhere most intimately connected and interdependent.

A general discussion was held concerning the attitude which the Socialist Party should adopt towards the General Confederation of Labor. One faction, led by Ghesquiere and Compère-Morel, attacked the labor-union confederation, opposing its anti-militarist ideas, and declared that the majority of the Confederation were anarchists at heart in emphasizing sabotage, general strike, and violence in the economic war.

Jaurès took a middle ground in the matter, and, while deprecating violence, declared that violence was the sign of a weak organization and that the way to avoid it was to strengthen the organization. He emphasized the fact that the working-class movement must be carried on in the economic field as well as in the political. Landier and Dormoy defended the labor-union confederation, declared in favor of their anti-militaristic views, and asserted that the unions then comprised (1911) 365,000 members, an increase of 45,000.

The following resolution was introduced by Compère-Morel, having been previously adopted by the Federation of Gard:

Whereas, it is the duty of the Socialists to combat anything which tends to divide the proletariat against itself, notably in opposing its co-operative or its labor-union organization and action to its political or Socialist organization;

Whereas, he is not a militant who can take seriously as a means of emancipation, sabotage, direct action, violence against scabs, etc., all of them methods which, by furnishing the capitalist government with the pretext for worse repressions, can only check the progress and development of the unions and of the party;

Whereas, the more the Socialists advocate labor-union action (the sole means of defense in a capitalist society), the more they owe it to their party and to themselves to rid themselves of those anarchists who, under cover and shelter of certain functions, with which they have not been invested by the unionists, never cease in their efforts to blacken and slander Socialism in its struggle for political power, to turn away the workers, and to leave them thus disarmed at the mercy of a capitalism, mistress both of capital and of the state;

Whereas, the Socialists of France would be veritable traitors, if they ceased a single instant in their work of making the proletariat understand that the labor-union or co-operative action, which is taking place within the limits of the capitalist system or of the master class, cannot suffice in itself; that it is essen-

tially defensive or reformatory, and *that only political action, exercised by means of the ballot, or applied through insurrection, is essentially revolutionary and capable of putting an end to the expropriators;*

The Congress reaffirms the resolution of the Congress of Stuttgart of 1907 relative to the relations between the Socialist Party and the labor unions which, passed by an overwhelming majority, has become law in the international working-class movement. (Our italics.)

After a stormy debate, in which Jaurès and Vaillant spoke against the above resolution, it was referred back to the committee on resolutions.

Dubreuilh reported in the name of the committee, and proposed for vote the following motion:

The Congress recognizes that, in their intervention in the Chamber, Comrades Ghesquiere and Compère-Morel had no other purpose than to serve the interests of the working-class, and that it regards it as extremely useful that the attention of the workers was called to the perils of a propaganda of anti-parliamentarism and of systematic violence.

It reaffirms the decisions taken on the subject of labor-union action and political action of the working-class at the National Congresses of Limoges, of Nancy, and of Toulouse, and at the International Congress of Stuttgart, and it invites all workers to draw therefrom inspiration for the necessary work of reconciliation.

This motion was then adopted almost unanimously.

IV. THE UNITED STATES

As it is impossible to understand the Socialist attitude towards the labor unions in the United States without a conception of the so-called Syndicalist movement or tendency, we print from the Socialist Campaign Book of 1912 a definition of Syndicalism by John Spargo.

1. SYNDICALISM

John Spargo, in *Syndicalism, Industrial Unionism, and Socialism*, defines Syndicalism as follows:

Syndicalism is a form of labor unionism which aims at the abolition of the capitalist system based upon the exploitation of the workers, and its replacement by a new social order free from class denomination and exploitation. Its distinctive principle as a practical movement is that these ends are to be attained by the direct action of the unions, without parliamentary action or the intervention of the state. The distinctive feature of its ideal is that in the new social order the political state will not exist, the only form of government being the administration of industry directly by the workers themselves.

The resolution on labor organizations adopted by the Socialist Convention of 1912 was in part as follows:

Political organization and economic organization are alike necessary in the struggle for working-class emancipation. The most harmonious relations ought to exist between the two great forces of the working-class movement—the Socialist Party and the labor unions. . . .

The Socialist Party therefore reaffirms the position it has always taken with regard to the movement of organized labor.

1. *That the party has neither the right nor the desire to interfere in any controversies which may exist within the labor-union movement over questions of form of organization or technical methods of action in the industrial struggle, but trusts to the labor organizations themselves to solve these questions.*

2. *That the Socialists call the attention of their brothers in the labor unions to the vital importance of the task of organizing the unorganized, especially the immigrants and the unskilled laborers, who stand in greatest need of organized protection and who will constitute a great menace to the progress and welfare of organized labor, if they remain neglected. The Socialist Party will ever be ready to co-operate with the labor unions in the task of organizing the unorganized workers, and urges all labor organizations, who have not already done so, to throw their doors wide open to the workers of their respective trades and industries,*

abolishing all onerous conditions of membership and artificial restrictions. In the face of the tremendous powers of the American capitalists and their close industrial and political union the workers of this country can win their battles only by a strong class-consciousness and closely united organizations on the economic field, a powerful and militant party on the political field, and by joint attack of both on the common enemy.

3. *That it is the duty of the party to give moral and material support to the labor organizations* in all their defensive or aggressive struggles against capitalist oppression and exploitation, for the protection and extension of the rights of the wage-workers and the betterment of their material and social condition.

4. That it is the duty of the members of the Socialist Party who are eligible to membership in the unions *to join and be active in their respective labor organizations.* (Our italics.)

The point of view of the industrial unionist as opposed to the syndicalist is shown below in an extract from Eugene V. Debs, the strong advocate of political action.

In *The International Socialist Review*, February, 1910, Debs says:

I cannot close without appealing for both the industrial and political solidarity of the workers.

I thoroughly believe in economic as well as political organization, in the industrial union, and in the Socialist Party.

I am an industrial unionist because I am a Socialist, and a Socialist because I am an industrial unionist.

I believe in making every effort within our power to promote industrial unionism among the workers and to have them all united in one economic organization. To accomplish this I would encourage industrial independent organization, especially among the millions who have not yet been organized at all, and I would also encourage the "boring from within" for all that can be accomplished by the industrial unionists in the craft unions.

I would have the Socialist Party recognize the historic necessity and inevitability of industrial unionism, and the industrial union reciprocally recognize the Socialist Party, and so declare in the respective preambles to their constitutions.

The Socialist Party cannot be neutral on the union question. It is compelled to declare itself by the logic of evolution, and

as a revolutionary party it cannot commit itself to the principles of reactionary unionism. Not only must the Socialist Party declare itself in favor of economic unionism, but the kind of unionism which alone can complement the revolutionary action of the workers on the political field.

I am opposed under all circumstances to any party alliances or affiliations with reactionary trade-unions and to compromising tactics of every kind and form, excepting alone in event of some extreme emergency.

2. SABOTAGE

While the industrial union is advocated by the majority of Socialists, the party has rejected, by convention and referendum, the weapons of "sabotage," which form part of the tactics of Syndicalism. Before printing the resolution on this subject, we quote from the Socialist Campaign Book the origin of the word "sabotage" and a criticism of the practice from the Socialist viewpoint.

John Spargo, in *Syndicalism, Industrial Unionism, and Socialism*, published by B. W. Huebsch, says:

The word "sabotage" was first used, I believe, in 1897 in a report of the Congress of the *Confédération Générale de Travail*, which met that year at Toulouse. Among the reports considered by the Congress was one dealing with the use of the boycott and the policy which had been adopted by the British unions of workers engaged in the trades connected with the ocean transport services, popularly known as Ca 'Canny. This report was written by Émile Pouget and Paul Delassale, both well-known anarchists. They wanted to find a French equivalent for the Scotch colloquialism, Ca 'Canny, as the purpose of their report to the Congress was to elaborate the British policy known by that name and recommend it to the French unions. They "coined" the word sabotage. Never before had it been used.

In France, especially in the rural districts, it has long been the custom to liken the slow and clumsy worker to one wearing wooden shoes, called "sabots." The phrase, *travailler à coups de sabots*, to work as one wearing wooden shoes, has long been used with reference to the slow and clumsy worker, the "old

soldier," as they say in England. It is so used, I think, by Balzac. The idea is obvious; the peasant with heavy wooden shoes walks clumsily and slowly in comparison with those who wear shoes of leather. So the word "sabotage"—literally, "wooden shoeage"—was coined by Pouget and by him and Delassale used in their report to the Toulouse Congress of the *Confédération Générale de Travail* as a good translation of the British term Ca 'Canny.

The Party Convention of 1912 adopted by a large majority the following constitutional clause against sabotage (usually referred to in party discussion as Article II, Section 6) :

Any member of the party who opposes political action or advocates crime, sabotage, or other methods of violence as a weapon of the working-class to aid in its emancipation shall be expelled from membership in the party. Political action shall be construed to mean participation in elections for public office and practical legislative and administrative work along the lines of the Socialist Party platform.

A considerable opposition was developed against this clause when the constitution was put to a referendum. Although passed, a substitute of entirely contrary import was also passed, but this latter action was declared void by the party authorities.

The following declarations on the subject of sabotage and direct action, by William D. Haywood, in a speech at Cooper Union, New York, provoked wide criticism, and led to his recall (by referendum) from the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party.*

I believe in direct action. If I wanted something done and could do it myself I wouldn't delegate that job to anybody. (Applause.) That's the reason I believe in direct action. You are certain of it, and it isn't nearly so expensive. . . .

* *International Socialist Review*, February, 1912.

So you understand that we know the class struggle in the west. And realizing, having contended with all the bitter things that we have been called upon to drink to the dregs, do you blame me when I say that *I despise the law* (tremendous applause and shouts of "No!") and I am not a law-abiding citizen? (Applause.) And more than that, *no Socialist can be a law-abiding citizen.* (Applause.) When we come together and are of a common mind, and the purpose of our minds is to overthrow the capitalist system, we become conspirators then against the United States Government. *And certainly it is our purpose to abolish this government* (applause) *and establish in its place an industrial democracy.* (Applause.) Now we haven't any hesitation in saying that that is our aim and purpose. Am I correct? (Tremendous applause.) Am I absolutely correct when I state this as being the position of the Socialist Party not only of New York, but of the United States and of every nation of the world? . . .

I am not going to take time to-night to describe to you the conditions in France, though I would like to do so, because *I again want to justify direct action and sabotage.* You have plenty of it over there. (Applause.) I don't know of anything that can be applied that will bring as much satisfaction to you, as much anguish to the boss as a little sabotage in the right place at the proper time. *Find out what it means. It won't hurt you, and it will cripple the boss.*

Eugene V. Debs, although a firm advocate of industrial unionism and a former member of the I. W. W., represents the majority of the party in his opposition to sabotage and violence. We give portions of his article entitled "Sound Socialist Tactics," in the *International Socialist Review* for February, 1910, and also of a letter written by Debs to William English Walling, on the occasion of Haywood's recall from the National Executive Committee, referred to above. In the *Review* he wrote:

There has recently been some rather spirited discussion about a paragraph which appears in the pamphlet on "Industrial So-

cialism," by William D. Haywood and Frank Bohn. The paragraph follows:

"When the worker, either through experience or study of Socialism, comes to know this truth, he acts accordingly. *He retains absolutely no respect for the property 'rights' of the profit-takers. He will use any weapon which will win his fight.* He knows that the present laws of property are made by and for the capitalists. *Therefore he does not hesitate to break them.*"

The sentences which I have italicized provoked the controversy.

We have here a matter of tactics upon which a number of comrades of ability and prominence have sharply disagreed. For my own part I believe the paragraph to be entirely sound.

Certainly all Socialists, knowing how and to what end capitalist property "rights" are established, must hold such "rights" in contempt. In the Manifesto, Marx says: "The communist (Socialist) revolution is the most radical rupture with traditional property relations; no wonder that its development involves the most radical rupture with traditional ideas."

As a revolutionist I can have no respect for capitalist property laws, nor the least scruple about violating them. I hold all such laws to have been enacted through chicanery, fraud, and corruption, with the sole end in view of dispossessing, robbing, and enslaving the working-class. But this does not imply that I propose making an individual lawbreaker of myself and butting my head against the stone wall of existing property laws. That might be called force, but it would not be that. It would be mere weakness and folly.

If I had the force to overthrow these despotic laws I would use it without an instant's hesitation or delay, but I haven't got it, and so I am law-abiding under protest—not from scruple—and bide my time.

Here let me say that for the same reason I am opposed to sabotage and to "direct action." I have not a bit of use for the "propaganda of the deed." These are the tactics of anarchist individualists and not of Socialist collectivists. They were developed by and belong exclusively to our anarchist friends and accord perfectly with their philosophy. These and similar measures are reactionary, not revolutionary, and they invariably have a demoralizing effect upon the following of those who practice them. If I believed in the doctrine of violence and destruction

as party policy; if I regarded the class struggle as guerrilla warfare, I would join the anarchists and practice as well as preach such tactics.

It is not because these tactics involve the use of force that I am opposed to them, but because they do not. The physical forerist is the victim of his own boomerang. The blow he strikes reacts upon himself and his followers. The force that implies power is utterly lacking, and it can never be developed by such tactics.

The foolish and misguided, zealots and fanatics, are quick to applaud and eager to employ such tactics, and the result is usually hurtful to themselves and to the cause they seek to advance.

There have been times in the past, and there are countries to-day where the frenzied deed of a glorious fanatic like old John Brown seems to have been inspired by Jehovah himself, but I am now dealing with the twentieth century and with the United States.

There may be, too, acute situations arise and grave emergencies occur, with perhaps life at stake, when recourse to violence might be justified, but a great body of organized workers, such as the Socialist movement, cannot predicate its tactical procedure upon such exceptional instances.

But my chief objection to all these measures is that they do violence to the class psychology of the workers and cannot be successfully inculcated as mass doctrine. The very nature of these tactics adapts them to guerrilla warfare, to the bomb planter, the midnight assassin; and such warfare, in this country at least, plays directly into the hands of the enemy.

Such tactics appeal to stealth and suspicion, and cannot make for solidarity. The very teaching of sneaking and surreptitious practices has a demoralizing effect and a tendency to place those who engage in them in the category of "Black Hand" agents, dynamiters, safe-blowers, hold-up men, burglars, thieves, and pickpockets.

If sabotage and direct action, as I interpret them, were incorporated in the tactics of the Socialist Party, it would at once be the signal for all the agents provocateurs and police spies in the country to join the party and get busy. Every solitary one of them would be a rabid "direct actionist," and every one would safely make his "get-away" and secure his reward, à la McPart-

land, when anything was "pulled off" by their dupes, leaving them with their necks in the nooses.

With the sanctioning of sabotage and similar practices the Socialist Party would stand responsible for the deed of every spy or madman, the seeds of strife would be subtly sown in the ranks, mutual suspicion would be aroused, and the party would soon be torn into warring factions to the despair of the betrayed workers and the delight of their triumphant masters.

If sabotage or any other artifice of direct action could be successfully employed, it would be wholly unnecessary, as better results could be accomplished without it. *To the extent that the working-class has power based upon class-consciousness, force is unnecessary; to the extent that power is lacking, force can only result in harm.*

I am opposed to any tactics which involve stealth, secrecy, intrigue, and necessitate acts of individual violence for their execution.

The work of the Socialist movement must all be done out in the broad open light of day. Nothing can be done by stealth that can be of any advantage to it in this country. . . .

Its tactics alone have prevented the growth of the Industrial Workers of the World. Its principles of industrial unionism are sound, but its tactics are not. *Sabotage repels the American worker.* He is ready for the industrial union, but he is opposed to the "propaganda of the deed," and as long as the I. W. W. adheres to its present tactics and ignores political action, or treats it with contempt by advising the workers to "strike at the ballot-box with an ax," they will regard it as an anarchist organization, and it will never be more than a small fraction of the labor movement.

The sound education of the workers and their thorough organization, both economic and political, on the basis of the class struggle, must precede their emancipation. Without such education and organization they can make no substantial progress, and they will be robbed of the fruits of any temporary victory they may achieve, as they have been through all the centuries of the past.

For one, I hope to see the Socialist Party place itself squarely on record at the coming national convention against sabotage and every other form of violence and destructiveness suggested by what is known as "direct action."

It occurs to me that the Socialist Party ought to have a standing committee on tactics. The art or science of proletarian party tactics might well enlist the serious consideration of our clearest thinkers and most practical propagandists.

To return for a moment to the paragraph above quoted from the pamphlet of Haywood and Bohn. I agree with them that in their fight against capitalism the workers have a right to use any weapon that will help them to win. It should not be necessary to say that this does not mean the blackjack, the dirk, the lead-pipe, or the sawed-off shotgun. The use of these weapons does not help the workers to win, but to lose, and it would be ridiculous to assume that they were in the minds of the authors when they penned that paragraph.

The sentence as it reads is sound. It speaks for itself and requires no apology. The workers will use any weapon which will help them win their fight.

The most powerful and the all-sufficient weapons are the industrial union and the Socialist Party, and they are not going to commit suicide by discarding these and resorting to the slung-shot, the dagger, and the dynamite bomb. (Our italics.)

Letter to William English Walling, March 5, 1913:

I regretted to see Haywood's recall, but it was inevitable. He brought it on himself. *I should not have put Section 6 in the constitution*, but it is there, and put there by the party, and Haywood deliberately violated it. Is this not the fact?

The question of what sabotage means has nothing to do with the matter. *Its advocates have shown that it means anything, everything, or nothing at all.* If I had been in Haywood's place, and had felt bound to advocate sabotage as he did, I would have withdrawn from the party to do it. If I had deliberately violated the constitution I would have expected to be called to account for it. Else why a constitution at all?

I am not now judging Haywood, I am answering your question. I am free to confess, however, judging from some of the reports I have seen, that Haywood has been talking a good deal more like an anarchist than a Socialist.

The I. W. W. for which Haywood stands and speaks is an anarchist organization in all except in name, and this is the cause of all the trouble. Anarchism and Socialism have never

mixed and never will. The I. W. W. has treated the Socialist Party most indecently, to put it very mildly. When it gets into trouble it frantically appeals to the Socialist Party for aid, which has always been freely rendered, and after it is all over the I. W. W. kicks the Socialist Party in the face. That is the case put in plain words, and the Socialist Party has had enough of that sort of business, and I don't blame them a bit. There are I. W. W. anarchists who are in the Socialist Party for no other purpose than to disrupt it, and the Socialist Party is right in taking a decided stand against them. . . . (Our italics.)

(Signed) E. V. DEBS.

March 5, 1913.

Debs, however, stated his opposition to Article II, Section 6, in "A Plea for Solidarity," published in the *International Socialist Review* for March, 1914.

I want to say that, in my opinion, *section six of article two ought to be stricken from the Socialist Party's constitution. I have not changed my opinion in regard to sabotage, but I am opposed to restricting free speech under any pretense whatsoever*, and quite as decidedly opposed to our party seeking favor in bourgeois eyes by protesting that it does not countenance violence and is not a criminal organization.

I believe our party attitude toward sabotage is right, and this attitude is reflected in its propaganda and need not be enforced by constitutional penalties of expulsion. If there is anything in sabotage we should know it, and free discussion will bring it out; if there is nothing in it we need not fear it, and even if it is lawless and hurtful we are not called upon to penalize it any more than we are theft or any other crime.

(See also "The General Strike," "Compulsory Arbitration," "Labor Legislation.")

CHAPTER II

THE GENERAL STRIKE

A FULL selection of documents illustrating the Socialist attitude on the use of the general strike as a means of preventing war will be found in *The Socialists and the War*.

The general strike as a means of political struggle in extreme cases has not only been a subject of continued Socialist controversy, it has been put into actual practice in a number of instances in the past decade. All the more important of the earlier general strikes are mentioned in the course of the discussion at the German Congress of 1913, which we summarize at considerable length, but several of these strikes fall in the period under discussion in the present volume, 1912-1915: the general strikes in Belgium, Italy, Russia, and New Zealand, each of which we describe from authoritative sources—with the exception of the Russian strike of 1914, to which we give a short reference only, since it is described at length in the above-mentioned volume.

I. THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF LONDON, 1896

On the question of the general strike, the International Congress at London (1896) voted a resolution of which the following are the essential points:

The Congress is of the opinion that strikes and boycotts are necessary means for realizing the ends of the working-class, but it does not believe in the present possibility of an international general strike; what is necessary is the labor-union organization

of the masses, since the extension of strikes to entire industries and entire countries depends on the extension of organization.

To make an international labor-union action possible, a central labor-union committee must be created in each country.

From this resolution there were soon to arise the International Labor Union "Secretariat" and Congresses, thus constituted by agreement with the International Socialist movement, the center of which is now in the Labor Union Secretariat at Berlin.

II. THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF AMSTERDAM, 1904

The following note by Longuet on the general strike discussion at the International Congress of Amsterdam (1904) is quoted from the *Encyclopédie Socialiste*:

The motion presented by Roland Holst in the name of the committee of the Congress showed that the International had changed its attitude in this question since the discussion at London in 1896. It rejected the so-called conception of the general strike, but it also declared: "The increase of the power of the working-class organization, the strengthening of their unity, while developing their class organizations, at the same time create the conditions necessary for the success of the mass strike, the day when the latter may be found necessary or useful."

To this resolution, a German delegate, Dr. Friedberg, single-handed, opposed the anti-parliamentarian conception. The resolution of the committee was also criticised by Aristide Briand (prime minister of France), on the ground that it was too moderate. Mr. Briand brought into the discussion the hypothesis of the possible suppression of universal suffrage, and asked, in the case of such suppression, what weapon the Congress would offer to the parliamentarian to take its place.

III. THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF STUTTGART, 1907

At Stuttgart (1907) Kautsky, presenting the position of the majority of the Congress, made the following criticism

of the French advocacy of the general strike as a weapon of the labor-union movement (see previous Chapter) :

The resolution of the French comrades is unacceptable to us. First, because it presents a general strike as a means of acquiring power in the labor-union struggle, while the German comrades regard it as only a fundamental weapon in the political struggle. . . . The general strike must not be regarded as a means of economic struggle.

IV. THE BELGIAN GENERAL STRIKE OF 1913

1. CAUSES LEADING UP TO THE STRIKE

Statement of Émile Vandervelde

(from *The Metropolitan Magazine*)

“The division of parties should correspond with vivid accuracy to the division of classes. On the one side . . . stands a Conservative Party with strongly Clerical tendencies. Over against it is arrayed the Socialist or Labor Party, championing the whole mass of the working-people. Between them is a Liberal Party, which is numerically weak and would wield but little influence if the system of plural voting—one vote for the poor man, three for the rich—did not artificially swell its representation in Parliament.

“At the close of the year 1911 it looked as if this Liberal Party was going to have its day. The Clericals had then a clear majority of only six votes in the Chamber of Representatives. They had tried to carry through an educational bill, commonly known as the Convent Law, whose purpose was to give to the parochial schools, controlled by the clergy, the same support from the national treasury as is given to the public common schools. Public opinion was aroused. The Liberals and the Socialists, declaring a truce on all other questions which divided them, joined forces against the common enemy.

“Together with opposition to the Convent Law, they put in the forefront of their campaign platform a demand for the abolition of plural voting and a revision of the constitution to provide for universal suffrage, pure and simple.

“They compelled the Government to dissolve Parliament. It seemed that, after 30 years of power, the Conservative Party was about to fall before a coalition majority of Liberals and Socialists. . . .

“But one important point had been overlooked—the conservative elements which formed the ‘right wing’ of the Liberal Party.

“From the moment when the Brussels financiers, the great industrial capitalists of Liège and Charleroi, the rich merchants of Antwerp, and the textile manufacturers of Ghent faced the prospect, if not actually of Socialists in the Ministry, . . . at any rate of an administration which could not stand without the votes of the Socialists in Parliament, and which, in order to keep their support, would have to carry out such reforms as the abolition of plural voting and the establishment of a progressive income tax—from that moment they deserted their own party and voted in mass for the government candidates.

“Instead of destroying the Clerical majority, the election of June 2, 1912, actually strengthened it. The new Chamber of Representatives contained 101 Catholic Conservatives, with a combined opposition of only 85 members—44 Liberals and Radicals, 2 Christian Democrats, and 39 Socialists.”

2. THE SPECIAL CONGRESS OF THE LABOR PARTY

(June 30, 1912)

a. *From the Speech of Vandervelde*

We had gone to the battle in a flush of joyous hope. We hoped, and a number of our adversaries feared, the annihilation of the clerical majority. But we had not sufficiently taken into account fraud, corruption, intimidation, exploitation of ignorance, or fanaticism. Above all, we had not taken into account sufficiently the class egoism of a part of the middle class. The clerical majority has not been destroyed. It has, on the contrary, been sensibly reinforced. But . . . it has not been reinforced at our expense. If the day of the 2d of June has been less a clerical victory than a clerico-conservative victory, it has not been a Socialist defeat. We have gained seats. . . .

It is not Socialism, directly, which has experienced a defeat: it is the Liberal Party, abandoned by a part of its followers, at the moment when, with keen foresight, it was making an effort and because it was making this effort, to defend public education and to put itself in line with democracy.

The defeat of the Liberal Party has been, at the same time, a defeat for democracy, and a defeat, at least apparently, for universal suffrage.

All our organizations, all our federations declare themselves in principle for a general strike.

3. PREPARATION FOR THE STRIKE

(Congress of March, 1913)

a. *Report of Anseele*

The committee has asked me to propose to you the proclamation of the strike for the 14th of April, according to the spirit of the Congress of June 30 (1912). Several propositions have been submitted to the committee:

(1) No strike. The partisans of that opinion said: The strike is useless and dangerous. Since the commission conceded by Mr. de Broquerrille will inevitably have to enlarge its scope, let us hesitate to turn against us public sentiment and thus injure our cause.

To these arguments we answered that, from the parliamentary point of view, we have obtained nothing more than at the time of the proclamation of the principle of the strike on the 30th of June.

If really there is progress in public opinion, it is the threat of the strike, it is the action of the working-class which has directed public opinion in favor of the revision. If you draw back, public opinion will also subside and become indifferent. The commission, if we remain inactive, will follow out the ideas of M. de Brocqueville. Some papers have said: Certainly, the commission will enlarge its sphere of study. But others, much more numerous, hold to the contrary. We have no official announcement from the Government.

We conceive the movement in this way: a strike for universal suffrage. We certainly know that it will not be able to give us universal suffrage during its duration, and that this movement will have to be followed by energetic and persevering action, perhaps by other strikes. No; the question is not of a strike of exhaustion. It was conceived before the 30th of June. We will not exhaust all our union cash for a political strike; this is what we have repeated from the beginning. We must keep our resources for the struggle against the bosses. When will the strike finish? No one knows. Facts will decide it and decisions will have to be taken according to circumstances. Future events will decide our future tactics. Will it be a revolutionary strike? No. It will be calm and peaceful. The conclusion of the plan of action that I am going to give shows it clearly. We want the strike to keep the character that the Congress of June 30 gave it.

And if, in some regions, the movement assumed another form, the great committee would resign. Is that clear? The strike must end as we want it to begin. If in the space of 24 hours hundreds of thousands of workers quit the shops and factories, it will be necessary that the proletarian army return to work, on a signal, with the same unity, with the same impulse, with the same spirit of discipline.

Why this general strike? For a quadruple object: to obtain universal suffrage, to keep unity among the Belgian Socialist proletariat, to maintain the confidence of the working-class in

themselves, to keep undulled the weapon of the general strike for future struggles.

.

You must be partisans of the general strike for still another reason. We are reproached because our unions occupy themselves with politics. What has politics brought to us? On the 14th of April there will be no more Flemish and Walloon; but only one nation; no more distinction between trades and corporations; the spirit of race and corporations will give place to the spirit of class, which is the pledge for the regeneration of our class.

b. *Speech of Vandervelde on the Strike*

Citizens, Huysmans spoke in the name of a minority that seems vanquished in advance. I agree completely with him.

I could argue against Destrée and Anseele now only by furnishing arguments to the enemy, and this I will not do. To try to go against the current which is in favor of the strike would be absolutely vain. It would be just as sensible to try to swim against the current of the rapids of the Congo or Niagara. The fact that we favored the tactics of conciliation was not a matter of sentiment but of reason. But those tactics could have succeeded only if we, the militants, had been unanimous in proposing them to the proletarians. And still it would have been hard to make them triumph, for we should have struck against the tenacious and violent will-power of the working-class in imposing on themselves weeks of suffering.

What has made, in fact, the general strike inevitable is not the will of Anseele and Destrée; but the bad will, the attitude of the Government and of those behind it. The clerical papers have had for you nothing but sarcasms and mockeries; they have amused us by semi-promises; they have had nothing but words of hatred and pride. It is said: "Who sows the wind, harvests the tempest." Well, the tempest is there; so much the worse for them! And now I have only one more word to say. The six months I have just lived through will count among the hardest and most painful of my political life. I have done, during six months, all that was humanly and superhumanly possible to avoid the general strike, for the working-class and for the country.

I ask you one thing with Huysmans, de Brouckère, Leken, Bertrand, Wauters, Denis, and others: we are going to be beaten; but we ask that, after having beaten us, you give us room among you, so that we can fight together against the common enemy!

c. Resolution Adopted

Whereas, the extraordinary Congress of the 30th of June, 1912, decided to employ the weapon of the general strike in case all other means to bring about the revision of the constitution will have failed, and this state of things seems to have been reached, the national committee, in its sitting of the 12th of February, fixed the 14th of April for the date of the general strike;

Whereas, upon the suggestion of the mayors of the principal cities of the kingdom, in order to allow a supreme effort of conciliation, the committee in its sitting of the 6th of March, withdrew the preceding decision;

Whereas, it was evident from the declarations of the leader of the Government that, in spite of this decision, and in spite of the authorization of the mayors to give to the representatives of the Labor Party the contrary hope, the Government has refused to study the problem of revision;

Whereas, under those conditions, we found ourselves in the same situation as before the 6th of March;

Whereas, it is necessary to notice the immense progress that the cause of revision has lately made in public opinion so that M. de Brocqueville himself is obliged to confess that some members of the extreme Conservatives are no longer hostile to revision;

Whereas, this progress is due to the indefatigable action of the Labor Party, and will continue only if that action continues itself with discipline and firmness;

Whereas, at the present time, no other mode of action, except the general strike, is proposed, and that the decisions of June 30, 1912, and February 12, 1913, have to be maintained; the Congress of the Labor Party

Resolves, that it would have willingly ratified the decision of the national commission if the Government had made the step toward compromise which it had allowed the mayors to hope for.

But with this refusal to study the question of the electoral problem in its entirety, a refusal imposed on the Government by a minority in revolt against the national sentiment, it is necessary to affirm by energetic action the loyalty of the Labor Party to universal suffrage; in consequence of which it has decided to begin the general strike upon the 14th of April.

It declares solemnly that this legal manifestation, made in order to show respect to the will of the nation, must remain legal and peaceful and disown in advance any attempt to give it any other character. It decides finally that it will be the task of an extraordinary congress of the Labor Party to decide when the strike shall end.

4. CONCLUSION OF THE STRIKE

(Congress of April 24, 1913)

a. *Speech of Vandervelde*

On the 23d of March last, I disagreed with the working-class about the advisability of the strike. But I do not hesitate to-day to say to the workers: "It is you who were right in having confidence; it is you who have managed so that the strike was peaceful, formidable, irresistible. For the strike has been irresistible. Did you expect universal suffrage from it immediately, immediate revision? Anseele, Destrée, on the 23d of March, declared to the contrary; the only thing sought after was that the whole question of the electoral problem should be studied. This examination of the electoral problem, did you obtain that? Some people doubt it: one of them wrote to me: "One doubts. Are not those only vague promises? Will the commission be established?" It will be in a few days. We will sit in it on the basis of the proportional representation of the three great parties, and there we will proceed according to the mandate prescribed by the plan of action of Masson.

Let us now summarize the parliamentary point of view. The right and left of the Congress pulled the ropes in two opposite directions. On one side the power of gold, of the army, and of the priests; in a word, the whole reaction, all the "reasons of state," a government which will not yield for fear of having to capitulate. On the other side, public opinion, the working-class on strike, with its irresistible power. Both sides pulled hard, and it is ours which has vanquished. What does it matter

if our adversaries affirm that they have gained the victory? They pretend that M. de Brocqueville had already proposed what later was accepted. But not in terms clear enough to be understood by the workingmen.

What is true is that M. de Brocqueville thought what he had not yet said, what he would have liked to say, but what he could not say freely and clearly. . . .

But the political results, what we have gained in public opinion, is much more important. They imagined, on the 2d of June, that we were crushed. But the working-class arose as a single man and used the virgin weapon of the general strike. And even before the strike was called, through the necessary preparation for that strike, we had already brought it about that the revision which was exacted by the Socialists and admitted by the Liberals, is to-day accepted by the Independents, and by a notable number of the Catholic Party, those who had to do with the Christian-Democrats. And we would be very difficult to please if we were not satisfied with such a result.

But above all we have obtained results from the Socialistic point of view, that should swell our hearts with pride. Before the 2d of June we were strong, and at the polls we saw the progressive accession of the proletariat to the Labor Party. But since the 2d of June, since our unceasing work for the organization of the general strike, don't you feel, comrades, as if you had grown morally, as if the working-class could walk more erect than ever? M. Woeste said: "I do not believe in the general strike. Either it will be peaceful and insignificant, or it will be formidable and not peaceful."

Well! The events have given the lie to these words. The strike has been peaceful; we have had less lawsuits in our industrial regions than generally, and the gendarmes who had been prepared for a massacre of the people have had nothing to do. And do not say that the strike, although peaceful, was not formidable. You can go and ask the shipowners of Antwerp about that.

5. WAS THE GENERAL STRIKE A SUCCESS?

a. *The Special Correspondent of Vorwaerts (Berlin)*

"When on the first day of the strike, at a given signal, an army of 300,000 left the factories, shops, pits, quarries,

glass-works, etc., it was branded as an undeniable fiasco. This fiasco grew in the measure in which the strikers increased to 400,000, perhaps to 450,000. The iron skeletons of the cranes in the port of Antwerp were inactive, factories had to be closed because the raw material was used up. Coal and iron, the heart and brain of industry, remained a dead mass. The general strike had crippled industry from Verviers to Tournai. But the Clerical press—especially the Brussels *Twentieth Century*—wrote every day that the masses of the workers were not taken in by the ‘bluff’ of the general strike. What did it matter that in answer to the ‘bluff’ two-thirds of the industrial workers of Belgium had responded?

“And further: Was it really a ‘general’ strike? Surely not, said the clergy. For we had fresh bread every morning, trolleys and railroads were running, warehouses were open, and work was done in the bureaus of the Ministry. Right. But what was the object of the workers? Did they wish to spoil the breakfast of the people, or prevent the ladies of the bourgeoisie from buying gloves and veils, or to drive M. von Brocqueville [the Premier] to despair by forcing him to be idle? The strike was directed,—as all the world knows—not against the public, not against the employers, but exclusively *against the Government*. It was not meant to induce the cobbler of X Street and the baker of the avenue to stop work, but to call out only the workers of large industries. Did they strike? At the time we brought forward the figures of the strikers in the coal region and the metal industry, where all the large and the largest works—for instance, Coekerill—had to shut down. And, further: textile-workers, stone masons, glass-blowers—from the celebrated works of Val St. Lambert—joined the strike. It was a veritable triumph. At last the still lingering diamond-cutters of Antwerp stopped

work. But more than this: the strike in its course induced hundreds and thousands of workers of smaller industries to join, and extended to branches which even the optimists of the strike movement had not hoped to influence. Especially Brussels showed unexpected results in this direction, and the strike in the capital was a complete success—in spite of all the silly lies of the clergy. In Brussels not only the factories of the suburbs struck, but also a number of smaller shops, the workers of which, carried away by the force of the strike, did not wish to remain inactive in the struggle for the rights of all. Furriers, coach-builders, ladies' tailors, bronze-workers, printers, mechanics, etc., etc., all trades were represented, some were out in full. And the town workers? Only a part could prove its solidarity, but we know that only a very little urging would have been necessary to augment the ranks.

“The official statistics show the following figures. Six hundred eighty-two thousand industrial workers took part in the strike. From this number we have to deduct the 100,000 women, who, not having suffrage, cannot participate in an agitation for the abolition of the plural vote. The figures given by the employers' statistics were 400,000 strikers. This result scarcely indicates a fiasco. If, on the other hand, we use as a basis the figures of the *Twentieth Century*, which gives 773,260 industrial workers, we have to deduct 175,753 women workers, of which number 65,438 work at home, there remain 598,260 industrial workers, of which number 36,000 again work at home. This result again takes us back to the original statistics, which declare that at least two-thirds of the industrial workers of Belgium participated in the general strike. Whether this fact shows a success or fiasco, it will be easy for a non-clerical individual to decide. Let us add that,

according to some employers' statistics, 71 per cent of the industrial workers took part in the strike."

b. The New Statesman (*Article signed C. M. L.*)

"What have been the effects of the general strike for adult suffrage? Certainly they have been far more important than could be gathered from the meager reports which have dribbled into our public press. The first question naturally is, what was the political result—how far, that is, did the strike achieve its avowed object of forcing adult suffrage? The world in general has been given to believe that it completely failed. In Belgium the Conservatives protest that the Government did not give way an inch, and that the position after the strike remained precisely as it was before. Now it is true that the Government refused, at the end, as at the beginning, to deal with the reform of the parliamentary franchise. But the two refusals were very different. The prime minister commenced (as was only to be expected) by flatly refusing to consider the question under the threat of a strike, though, of course, 'the franchise laws were not immutable.' After the strike he said: 'We will make no promise to deal with the question; but the commission which we are appointing to consider the local government franchise will not be debarred from taking into consideration also the parliamentary franchise.' We, in England, at least, are not so unfamiliar with the forms under which a statesman is allowed to save his face that we cannot appreciate the difference between these two utterances.

"But there is another aspect of the matter, apart from its purely political side. A great movement in a nation's life is never in reality an isolated event, to be judged

solely by its success or non-success in attaining its immediate object. Its indirect effects are often of equal, or even greater, importance. Looked at from this standpoint, the Belgian general strike is worthy of the closest study. Let us see, then, how it has affected the trade-unions in particular and the working-class in general.

“Now trade-unionism in Belgium, as in other Continental countries, is not the more or less homogeneous thing that we know in England. There is a ceaseless and a bitter opposition between the Socialists and the Catholics. The Socialist unions are militant political organizations; the Catholics are purely professional associations, leaving politics and Parliament severely alone, concerning themselves only with the ‘economic’ interests of the wage-earners. Between these two armies, the one pursuing ‘*la lutte des classes*,’ the other proclaiming ‘*l’entente des classes*,’ there is war to the death. The Christian unions opposed the general strike. Before it began they boasted that they would prevent it—or break it. When it was over, they claimed that it had been a pit which their enemies had dugged for themselves, that great numbers of Socialist workmen had deserted in disgust to the Catholic unions. But, as a matter of fact, there is very little evidence of this. The Socialist unions may have lost a few hundreds, or a few thousands, of members here and there. But what they have lost in one place they have gained in another. And where members have fallen out, they have not gone over to the Catholics; they have simply been the victims, for the moment, of intimidation or revenge on the part of the employers. The undoubted increase which the Catholics have made seems rather to have been due to the general ‘boom’ in trade-unionism, and to some extent also to the stimulus to organization given by the abhorred strike itself!

“As a whole, then, the trade-union movement has gained as a result of the strike—slightly in numbers, enormously in solidarity and morale. It is, however, from the broadest democratic point of view that the results of the general strike have been most notable. It was a profound moral lesson to the working-class. It not only showed them their powers, it filled them with confidence and pride in themselves, in their own capacity and perseverance.

“When the general strike actually took place, friends and enemies alike were astonished. Out of a total working population of a million, despite the fact that the Socialist unions could claim less than 150,000 members, and despite the open hostility of the 50,000 or 60,000 Christian trade-unionists, something like 450,000 stopped work. The strike was no less remarkable in its orderliness than in its extent. During the ten days that it lasted there were actually fewer ‘police-court cases’ than in normal periods! Small wonder that many, who had felt doubtful at first, exchanged congratulation for apprehension, and that the Socialist leaders were proud of their mobilization of such an army, and of its behavior in the field. And small wonder that, when the strike was declared off, they believed—as they continue to believe—that something very big had been achieved. If, as some of the prophets think, another demonstration may be necessary before the prize is won, they will have gained no little experience and confidence for its organization.”

V. THE PROPOSED GENERAL STRIKE FOR EQUAL SUFFRAGE IN PRUSSIA

The German Congress of 1913 discussed the general strike in a very fundamental way. We give a full epitome

of this discussion—the most weighty that has ever taken place around this issue.

1. RESOLUTION OF THE PARTY EXECUTIVE RELATIVE TO THE GENERAL STRIKE

According to a resolution passed by the Party Convention at Jena (1905) and indorsed at Mannheim (1906), the widest use of the general strike may, under given conditions, be considered one of the most effective weapons of the working-class, not only in the defense of rights it already possesses, but in the struggle for new popular rights and privileges.

The right of general, direct, equal, and secret suffrage, the right to participate in the election of all representative bodies of our government, is an indispensable asset in the struggle for freedom of the modern proletariat. The three-class suffrage system [in Prussia] not only deprives the poorer classes of a fundamental right, it hinders them in their struggle for a better existence and places the bitterest enemies of organized labor, the foes of all social growth, the land-owning feudal class, at the head of our government.

Therefore the Party Congress of Jena (1913) calls on the enslaved masses to take up the fight, to carry it through with the energy and enthusiasm of men and women who know that this struggle cannot be won without great sacrifices.

While the Party Congress condemns the promiscuous, anarchistic use of the general strike, as an unfailing weapon in working-class struggles, it is, on the other hand, of the opinion that the proletariat must use every means, must use its whole strength, to secure political freedom. A political general strike can be carried out with a fair certainty of success only if all parts of the working-class movement are wholly united, if it is fought by a mass of workers filled with the enthusiasm of Socialist ideals, by an army of men and women ready to sacrifice everything to the success of the fight.

Therefore, the Party Congress declares that it be the duty of every comrade to be tireless in his work for the growth and perfection of [both] the political and industrial organizations of our class.

2. FROM THE RESOLUTION OF THE MINORITY RELATING TO THE GENERAL STRIKE

Rosa Luxemburg and others moved to substitute for paragraphs 2 and 4 in the above, the following:

The growing bitterness of the industrial and political class struggle in Germany calls for growing strength and increasing power of the proletariat to resist the secret blows of the ruling class, to carry on the struggle for the betterment of its economic conditions, to wrest from the hands of the Government greater political rights. The political struggle steadily forces the proletariat to strain every effort, for it represents the fight for general, equal, and direct suffrage to all representative bodies of our government. The right to the ballot is a fundamental necessity in the struggle of the proletariat for industrial and social liberty.

The existing condition, which renders the laboring-class politically powerless, especially in Prussia, where the three-class suffrage law obtains, hinders it in its struggle for a better existence and places the bitterest enemies of organized labor, the foes of all social growth, at the head of the Government, not only in Prussia, but in the whole nation.

This shameful suffrage law can be overthrown only by a storm of protest, by a great mass action such as was considered by the Prussian Party Convention of 1910.

.

3. SCHEIDEMANN, SPEAKING FOR THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The Prussian state elections have taken place. They have resulted in a great gain of votes. According to the calculations of our opponents, we must have polled at least a million votes, and in spite of this huge gain, we have won only one additional seat by our own strength. Through agreements with the Progressive People's Party, we have gained three additional seats in the second balloting. None of us expected anything better, and still the result is shameful. It seems as if the Prussian election laws must lash every last man into a fury of indignation; that a party which has polled a million votes should be returned to the Landtag with just exactly seven men.

A few thousand men, farmers and officials, can be marched to the ballot box, and can elect a reactionary into office; it takes far more than a hundred thousand men, men who take part in the elections in spite of the greatest difficulties, men who risk their jobs when they cast their vote, . . . to return one Socialist to the Landtag.

The shame of it cries to heaven! And still the people do not protest. During our discussions on the election, while we were arguing about our attitude toward the military and the tax bills, . . . when everyone was talking about . . . our lack of success, a feeling of dissatisfaction naturally arose . . . and then . . . someone said, "General strike."

Comrades, when this word fell among us a peculiar debate arose. . . . All . . . agreed that the time was not ripe for the attempt. Comrades, the executive committee knew it before this discussion was taken up, and because we knew it we did not say it, because we believed that even if we knew it, our enemies need not know what we cannot do. We felt it rather unwise to tell our opponents: "I have another weapon, and if I use it you will be done for! But you needn't be afraid. At present I cannot use it." We have heard the argument that the whole discussion has grown out of the feeling of the masses. I deny that! The speeches we hear and the articles we read did not in the most cases reflect the spirit of the masses. On the other hand, I do not go to the extreme to which some of you go when you declare that the whole general strike agitation is the product of a few intellectuals. . . . But he who knows the masses—and most of us live among them—he knows that the class-conscious worker is too familiar with the labor market, knows too well of what clay the so-called organized laborers, the yellows and the Christians and the unorganized, are fashioned. And therefore they say, though they say it with clenched fists: "The time has not yet come."

Comrades! I will tell you plainly how we of the executive committee regard this question. We are in accord with the resolutions adopted at Jena and at Mannheim. Among other things, we resolved there: "When the executive committee believes that the time for a general strike has come, it shall immediately call upon the General Commission of Labor Unions, and shall take all steps which seem necessary to carry out the strike successfully." You may be sure that the executive committee is deter-

mined to respect the motions of past conventions, and that it will act accordingly.

During the debate on the general strike we heard repeated reference to Russia, to Belgium, to Sweden. These comparisons are lame. We are well informed concerning the strikes in Sweden and Belgium. We know and appreciate the wonderful preparatory work which was done, especially by our Belgian comrades. . . . But, comrades, we forget . . . one important circumstance. . . . Our Belgian and Swedish comrades knew that . . . they could go into the fight with the certainty that over there, across the border, they have a big brother, who will gladly help if matters come to a crisis. Comrades, we have no big brother over the border. . . . These comparisons cannot stand. Then a word as to Russia. I will not deny that we have in Germany, and especially in Prussia, conditions which forcibly remind one of Russian methods, but . . . after all, let us compare the lot of the Russian workingman with that of the German. What rights has the former? He has the right to the knout, the right to Siberia. He is moved, therefore, by very different motives in his protest against tyranny. . . .

What is to be the aim and end of this strike [that is now proposed]? The winning of manhood suffrage in Prussia. What do you mean by that? We want the right to send representatives to Parliament that they may work there in our interests. And in order to arouse the enthusiasm of the masses for the general strike we proceed to ridicule parliamentary activity. We cry, "Parliamentarism is Cretinism." You ask, can we gain anything for the proletariat by parliamentary activity! But you ask the working-class to enter into a mass strike to gain the right to elect representatives to a parliament in which they can accomplish nothing, a parliament whose work you describe as Cretinism! I cannot understand such logic. . . .

We will have the general strike when it becomes inevitable, but until then, let us remember Bebel's words: "The general strike is the '*ultima ratio*' of the Social Democracy." Let us bide our time.

. . . The problem before us must be definitely separated from the question of a spontaneous general strike, one that grows, with elemental force, out of the industrial life of a people that, widening and spreading, leads to sharp conflicts and finally to a general

settlement. We must not forget that, notwithstanding our great strength, we are after all a minority of the working-class, though a large one. Our party is democratic in its principles. No one would contend that the majority should determine the views of the minority. It would be just as undemocratic to force the majority, through a mass strike of the minority, to make Socialist politics. There is only one way to prepare for the final struggle—education, organization. To my mind a special propaganda for the general strike is wrong. Teach the masses the meaning of our movement, make them class-conscious; that is the work we must do. Everything else will take care of itself. . . .

As the situation grows more and more critical, the need of perfect discipline grows daily greater. On several occasions we have passed through dangerous periods, times when it seemed as if the brutal tyranny of the rulers of our country, and especially of our Prussian powers, could no longer be borne. We were strong enough to pass through these crises without bloodshed, but it was thanks to the Social Democratic movement, to the self-sacrificing discipline of its members. I wish to remind you of this, those of you who believe that a general strike is not possible without bloodshed. Our comrades in Belgium have proved that great strikes can be managed without riots, without loss of life. There was no confusion, no lawlessness. The most admirable feature of the strike was its wonderful order, its rigid discipline. He is pursuing a dangerous course who tries to prepare the way for a general strike by breaking up the discipline of labor organizations, by robbing the masses of their confidence in their leaders, by glorifying the unorganized as the saviours of their class. Where we have discipline and order, where all hearts work in harmony, where leaders and their followers are bound to each other by mutual, unswerving confidence, there, and only there, can we fight and win the final battle.

4. BERNSTEIN, FOR THE MAJORITY

I was one of the first members of the German Socialist Party to declare that it may become advisable, perhaps inevitable, that we adopt the general strike. I still hold this opinion, and I will vote in favor of the resolution presented by the executive board. Further, in view of present conditions in Germany, I am not prepared to go. The industrial outlook warns us against adopt-

ing the romantic ideals of those who believe in the present possibility of a general strike. . . .

How do you propose to carry out your general strike in Germany? Will you go into it blindfolded, without considering the possible results? We, too, know how to begin! But I should like to know how it will end! Perhaps Comrade Rosa Luxemburg can offer suggestions. In Belgium, 370,000 to 450,000 workers took part in the well-prepared strike. If we wish to do as well, relatively, we must be able to draw out at least two and a half to three million workers. Will you tell me (to Rosa Luxemburg) whether you think this is possible? Can you arrange such a strike without violent uprisings; can you keep it up without a great slump after the first enthusiastic days are over? For in such a strike the first loss in numbers spells failure. Let us be guided by past experience. Different countries vary widely in their attitude toward the general strike, according to traditions and the strength of the party organization. Liebknecht, in an article in the *Neue Welt*, of Berlin, mentions Sweden, saying that we might have learned there how to carry on a strike. (Denial from Liebknecht.) It was so reported in the *Vorwaerts*. The Swedish strike of 1909, though not political in character, was a mass strike of the Swedish workers. What was the result? I will not speak of the illusions that were cherished. . . . In 1907 and 1908 the Swedish Labor Union Federation numbered about 180,000 members. . . . Then came the great strike in 1909, and to-day the Swedish Labor Federation has dwindled so that it counts 80,000 to 90,000 members. . . . The experience of others should teach us caution. . . . We must consider the conditions peculiar to our own country. We must reckon with the strong organization of the manufacturing class, with the opposition of other organizations which stand against the unions that are with us in the struggle. And then, I repeat, when will you stop your general strike? When universal suffrage has been granted? You might just as well say that you will stop when the red flag flies over Berlin. . . .

5. ROSA LUXEMBURG, FOR THE MINORITY

When I heard the speech of Comrade Scheidemann yesterday, a feeling of sadness crept over me, as I recalled last Sunday's opening of our Convention, and the greetings that were brought

to us by our foreign guests, from Holland, from Belgium, and from Switzerland. One after the other they repeated, "To us nothing is so important in your Convention as the debate on the general strike; for us in Holland, in Belgium, in Switzerland the question has become a burning one. But we feel, though in our countries the general strike is no longer theoretical, but a practical question in party tactics, that we must go to the German Social Democracy, to the leaders of the International movement, for a deep, thoroughgoing, serious discussion of the underlying principles of this problem." Then came Scheidemann's speech on the mass strike. I fear our foreign guests will hardly feel repaid if they expected from our party leaders an unbiased and broad-minded treatment of this very important subject. If they hoped to get from our executive committee a wide outlook over the political and industrial situation in Germany, and within the German Party, in connection with this subject; if they expected to hear definite proposals for future activity, or a clear-cut statement of party tactics and party work, I fear they have not been repaid. For Scheidemann's speech was anything but a logical and serious consideration of the problem. It sounded but two notes. He cried with Faust's *Famulus Wagner*, "See how wonderfully we have progressed on every hand." He calls to arms against the grumblers, against the dissatisfied critics in the party itself. . . . I believe that the first requisite for a real political leader . . . is a sensitive ear for all that lives and moves in the soul of the masses. . . .

The great mass of our organized members, the rank and file, is thirsting for a new spirit in our party life, . . . that a more vigorous, a more virile tone be used in our struggle, [and] are sick of the all-holy methods of only-parliamentarism. . . . The executive board itself was forced to admit in its official report and in Scheidemann's speech a number of disquieting facts. We hear that our membership does not show the desired increase, that our newspapers report, in some cases, a standstill; in some cases, even a loss in the number of readers. Scheidemann tells us that every sensible man would expect the masses to rise in revolt against conditions in Prussia, against the Prussian suffrage law, against the shameful result of the last Prussian election. . . .

He was forced to admit that our agitation against the military bill was a deplorable failure. These are facts, facts that would speak to every serious party leader of the need of a thorough

analysis of conditions, facts that call for decisive measures, which demand that we search for the roots of the existing evil and remedy it by adequate and fundamental changes. And yet the executive passes lightly over them. Standstill in organization? Loss of readers? Why, it's the crisis! Shall we look placidly on while each industrial crisis overthrows what we have painstakingly built up in the years of prosperity?

The Prussian people did not revolt after the shameful result of the elections, as it seemed to Scheidemann they should. But our executive has nothing to say. . . . It might be a little more to the point to ask if our tactics were not to blame, . . . to ask what can be done to avoid such occurrences?

Then comes the unbelievable failure of our great movement against the military bill, this most outrageous piece of imperialistic audacity we have ever experienced. Again, our board finds a plausible explanation. . . . Our executive board should have been the first to sound the alarm, to place the question before the whole party. If we have accomplished so little, must we not seek new ways and means to imbue the masses with the thought and ideals of the Socialist movement? Instead, we are pacified with weak explanations and comforting assurances.

6. BAUER, FOR THE MAJORITY

The labor unions have been criticised because they have not yet spoken on the question of the general strike. It has been called characteristic of their whole attitude. But the whole question is not a labor-union question. I am not speaking here as a union man, but as a comrade. The labor-union movement has no reason for taking part in this discussion. Because a few comrades who are always dissatisfied with the growth of the party and the activity of its leading committees are pleased to discover a new method by which they hope to influence our tactics along really revolutionary lines, we are all expected to rush pell-mell after them to take part in the discussion. . . . To carry on such debates constantly brings not a growth but a demoralization of the movement, and the union leaders have not the slightest interest in the pursuance of such activities. I believe that the unions stand aloof with a feeling of strength. Because they know their might, because the leaders know their responsibility, they do not join in this game of generalities that can

produce no practical results. Comrade Luxemburg admits that, at the present time, the general strike is unfeasible. . . .

To investigate fairly the possibilities of a mass strike and its defects, we must look to those countries where it has already received a practical application. We must profit by their experiences. The first general strike of importance took place in Holland. A number of experienced men have debated its effects in the columns of the *Frankfurter Volkstimme*. Ankersmith, of Amsterdam, expressly states that the strike was followed by increased persecution of the proletariat. The strike was called as a protest against the attempted encroachments upon the rights of the railroad and state employees to organize. The strike was a failure, and as a result the new labor laws of 1906 contained a number of reactionary clauses directed against workmen, among others one which prohibited picketing.

We had a great general strike movement in Sweden. Swedish labor unions, which were forced into the struggle by the united manufacturers, at that time were a splendidly organized body. It was a heroic struggle, but possible only because, hand in hand with the workers of that small country, went the solidarity of the workers of other nations, above all, that of the German Social Democracy. Without the millions collected from foreign sources the strike would have collapsed long before, would have become a catastrophe for the Swedish workers. What would Germany do in a similar situation? To whom should we look for support? Germany leads all other countries of the workers' International in practical solidarity. Except from Austria and Scandinavia, we could expect little support beyond, perhaps, the famous telegram from France which expressed heartfelt sympathy and contributed 20 francs.

In Sweden, the mass strike resulted in the loss of about one-half of the labor-union membership. For years to come effective labor struggles in Sweden are practically out of the question; the best workers in the Swedish movement have been forced to emigrate. If we will profit by these experiences we will be extremely careful in considering the general strike as a factor in our struggle.

In Belgium, the strike was comparatively successful. It was not forced over the hands of the leaders, however, but was well organized and thoroughly prepared. It was, above all, a splendid, disciplined movement, one that reflects the highest honor upon

the Belgian proletariat. The comrades who stood in the advanced guard of the Belgian uprising believe that much has been gained. But we have secured the views of a dozen of the most prominent labor leaders of Belgium, and their opinions differ radically from those expressed by the party officials. Comrade Schneider, of the German Factory Workers' Union, who was in Belgium at the time of the strike, expresses a still more unfavorable opinion. The union officers report that the number of those blacklisted after the strike is so great that for years to come the whole energy of the unions will be used up in assisting them. This means that the labor movement in Belgium has suffered a relapse from which it will require many years to recover. . . .

Comrade Luxemburg agitates for Syndicalism, for continuous tumults and excitement, for a wild strike here and another there. Such things are impossible in Germany. Our unions have taken care of that. What has been the effect of Syndicalist activity in Italy? The national industrial organizations are disrupted; the workers are powerless. In France, where they preach general strike and use it wherever possible, these strikes have become harmless to the employers. These uprisings have no practical value. They usually result in more stringent laws against the laboring population. . . .

7. KARL LIEBKNECHT, FOR THE MINORITY

It is unfair to make those who call for a general strike appear as though they were only idle talkers. The whole situation, as it lies before us since the last Prussian election, calls louder than words for a thorough discussion of the means we have at our command. Not the whim of an intellectual has precipitated this turmoil; it was the inevitable result of the present crisis that caused this call for the general strike. I agree with you that this discussion was aroused at an inopportune moment. But it arose because it had to come, because it was a necessity. Its coming at this unfortunate time . . . is not sufficient reason for ridiculing the problem that has grown out of the heart of the proletarian movement; is no excuse for discrediting it as has been, and is being systematically done. I must reproach the Comrades Scheidemann and Bauer for doing this. I know very well that some of those who are called general strike fanatics have gone too far. I do not, by any means, agree with all that has been

said and written. . . . This attempt, upon the part of the Comrades Scheidemann, Bauer, and others, to discredit the supporters of a general strike, should cause us to study the executive committee resolution closely, to interpret it with a measure of distrust. The resolution purports to be a renewed declaration in favor of the general strike. There is no need of such a declaration. We have given it at Jena and at Mannheim. But the resolution contains something that makes it thoroughly unpalatable, the reference, I mean, to a complete harmony of all parts of the working-class movement. Such harmony is well-nigh impossible. If that were a necessary condition there would never have been a general strike. The phraseology of the resolution tends clearly to weaken, not to encourage. Nor do I understand why this resolution should demand so insistently that the great mass be "filled with the enthusiasm of Socialist ideals," that it be "ready to sacrifice everything for the success of the fight." This is peculiar where we are discussing a struggle for a right which is not purely proletarian, but merely democratic in its principles, a struggle in which we are sure to have a certain measure of assistance from non-proletarian sources. These passages in the resolution presented by the executive board show plainly enough the desire to handcuff the general strike discussion, not only for the present, but for all time. . . .

You who declare, on the one hand, that you desire a general strike, and say, on the other hand, that you want deeds, not words, what do you mean? I insist that Comrade Scheidemann, and with him the others who purport to be upholders of the general strike, are in favor of it only in words. Deep down in their hearts they, too, are opponents. Their arguments are arguments against the idea of a general strike. If the objections advanced by Scheidemann and Bauer were sound, if the objections made by Bernstein . . . were valid, then the general strike is rank nonsense, and we need no resolution. . . .

Bauer makes a mistake when he says: "Why do we speak of these things? We will call the general strike when the moment for it has come." No, in order to call a strike in this sense, if we wish to avoid a wild, uncontrolled uprising, the idea must first be understood by the people. They must know its whole meaning, realize its whole responsibility. The thought must become alive in the masses, and it can become alive only in the living flow of popular discussion. Whether or not to-day is the

time to begin has nothing to do with the question. Schiedemann's comparison with a weapon we are not ready to use does not hold water. No one has said the general strike shall be used to-day. . . . But even in times of great hardship we may, we must prepare new weapons for the future. And these new weapons in the struggle for political freedom must be sharper than those we have used before. . . .

8. STATEMENT OF BELGIAN DELEGATES

The Belgian labor unions have not, on the whole, suffered any material loss of members through the general strike. Reports submitted three months before and three months after the strike prove this conclusively. When we speak of losses in some places we must also consider the gains that others have made. One hundred minus 10 equals 90, but 90 plus 10 is again 100.

It is incorrect to maintain that the labor unions of Belgium had to use the greater part of their financial resources to assist the victims of the general strike. The books of the relief fund for the support of the black-listed strikers were closed more than two months ago. We have proved to the clerical press that the general strike has neither endangered nor crippled the financial condition of the labor-union movement. In Brussels alone, *Le Peuple*, through a single appeal, collected more than 100,000 francs in voluntary contributions for the wagon-makers who have been locked out for three months, and who for six weeks supported their members from their own fund. You see the Belgian unions are by no means weakened; on the contrary, they are preparing for new struggles.

The conflicts of the locked-out wagon-workers and of the hat-makers of Brussels, as well as those of the metal-workers of Antwerp (2,000 of whose members are unemployed because the industry is suffering heavily through the crisis), are of a purely economic nature. The former both began before the general strike. Nor can we regard the metal-workers as its victims, since they joined the strike after an understanding with their employers.

This correction is not to be construed as an interference on the part of the Belgian delegates in German affairs. Every nation must determine its own tactics. But the delegation here represented considered it their duty to oppose the spread of legendary stories concerning the Belgian general strike.

9. SCHEIDEMANN, CLOSING THE DEBATE

[The minority resolution declares that] "A mass strike cannot be called at the command of party or union leaders; it cannot be artificial in its conception." I believe we all agree that a general strike cannot be artificially produced. . . . But the sentence I have quoted expresses a tinge of ridicule, in fact it directly opposed the resolution of Jena and Mannheim. What do we read there? "When the executive committee believes that the time is ripe for a general strike it shall act hand in hand with the General Commission of Labor Unions to take such steps as seem necessary to the success of this measure." Surely that means that the executive bodies of the party and labor-union movements shall be empowered to enforce decisive measures.

But here in the minority resolution we read: "Not at the command of party or union leaders." Comrades, I will tell you wherein, in my opinion, lies the fundamental difference between the resolution of the executive committee and that of Comrade Luxemburg. The former speaks in favor of an eventual general strike, carried out by a well-disciplined, well-trained, class-conscious proletariat that will act when the signal is given. The latter can be interpreted in only one way—as a defense of wild strikes; in other words, a defense of that which we commonly call "Syndicalism." (Ledebour: "Perversion!") But, comrades, if that is not the significance of this resolution, why do you not simply indorse the decisions of Jena and Mannheim, that these committees be empowered to act at the right moment? No, it is impossible for those of us who desire to follow our proved tactics, . . . who are ready when the time shall come to support a general strike, . . . to support this resolution.

There have been objections to the fourth paragraph of the executive committee resolution which repudiates the methods of those who propagate uprisings, wild strikes, foolish, ill-considered strikes that must break our own backs. This clause was absolutely necessary. Again the resolution states: "A political general strike can be carried out with a fair certainty of success only where all parts of the working-class movement are wholly united." "What do you mean by 'wholly united'?" we have been asked. The point is simply this—that a majority in each of the committees in question must vote favorably before any decisive action can be undertaken. The "wholly," therefore, must not be mis-

understood to read that the "nay" of a single man may make action impossible.

10. "VORWAERTS"—EDITORIAL SUMMARY

If we needed proof for our contention that a discussion of the general strike need not be a waste of time . . . the general strike debate to which we listened to-day furnished it in a most convincing form. For the arguments used by some of our authoritative comrades proved, more plainly than words, how necessary it is to implant the desire for revolutionary activity more deeply into the masses, that we may stand prepared for battle when the fateful hour comes.

We do not, by any means, see in the political mass strike a remedy for all ills, an irresistible force which will throw open the great doors of the future with one mighty blow. We do not wish to drive a German worker lightly into a grave conflict. We, too, are seriously concerned for the welfare of the organizations built up by decades of laborious and deserving effort for the protection and the assistance of the working-class. Nor do we favor senseless uprisings and Syndicalistic attempts. On the contrary, we are unalterably opposed to senseless revolutionary romanticism. But in spite of this we consider it just as wrong, just as senseless, just as harmful to the party, to believe that the revolutionizing of the public spirit can be left for all times in the hands of our leaders, that the executive committee of the party and the General Commission of Labor Unions would, infallibly, *when the situation is ripe*, take the necessary steps to prepare "suitable measures." . . .

However well our labor unions may be fitted to carry out everyday labor struggles, they may not yet understand how to arouse that stubborn, unyielding spirit of battle that alone will enable us to bear up under the severe conflict that stands before us. Popular discussion of the general strike has this advantage, that it destroys romantic revolutionary as well as revisionistic illusions and shows to the masses the whole bitterness, the greatness of the struggle. Surely a few resolutions are not enough. Unceasing intensive agitation and education must arouse the masses to great sacrifices, without which no class in the whole history of human progress has ever won its emancipation. . . .

Many comrades look upon the general strike as a means of

defense against encroachments upon our right to organize, and upon our political rights, but regard it as a poor weapon for aggressive warfare. . . . What if they attempt, by artistic rearrangement of the election districts, to oust the Socialists where they are most firmly seated? Will you then use the general strike which you deemed so dangerous for an attack upon Prussian reaction? . . .

It was gratifying that, among others, Comrade Frank objected not only to the blanketing of the general-strike discussion, but also to the "conservative phraseology" that Comrade Bauer felt called upon to use in opposition to the so-called revolutionary phraseology of others. He declared the general strike must become a familiar weapon in the hands of the workers, if we desire them to be ready to sacrifice, not for a small increase in wages, but for the interest of our class. . . .

(The general-strike debate was closed at a late hour by the adoption of the resolution of the executive committee by a vote of 335 against 142. . . .)

VI. THE GENERAL STRIKE IN ITALY, 1914 *

By Oda Olberg

"This general strike differed in principle in no way from the earlier general strikes which have been proclaimed as protests against police outrages since 1904. The difference lay only in the scope of movement: it was deeper, more inclusive, and more threatening. . . .

" . . . The bloodshed of the 7th of June in Ancona gave rise to three different movements which had scarcely any other relation with one another than their common cause. The executive committee of the Socialist Party and the Federation of Labor proclaimed a general strike in the whole country immediately upon the news of the bloodshed [at Ancona]. Independent of this protest movement, and from 24 to 28 hours earlier, a movement broke out in Romagna which was led by a committee of Republicans and anarchists of

* From an article in *Die Neue Zeit*, July 31, 1914.

Ancona. This movement was completely spontaneous, . . . and was cut off from all relation with the movement of the country at large by the disabling of telegraph and telephone and the cessation of railway service during the whole of the duration of the strike. After the mass movement in Romagna had overflowed into the neighboring provinces on the 8th of June, and on the midnight of the 8th was declared in the whole country, the union of railway workers proclaimed a general strike on the night of the 10th of June, without accomplishing anything further than the crippling and obstruction of the railway traffic in various towns of the country. This movement, which as a demonstration of power was a total failure, was conducted by the railway workers' union. . . .

“The readiness of the great mass of workers of Italy to strike . . . is a generally known and a noteworthy fact. When it comes to a protest against brutalities of the police, the Italian proletariat has always been ready for action. But the Federation of Labor, the party executive, and the [Socialist] group in Parliament have frequently not been ready. Nevertheless, strikes had become the rule, so that the Federation of Labor, which now, as before, is in Reformist hands, regarded it as the lesser evil to support the movement, which it could not check, rather than to be carried along with it.

“The party executive, since the Congress of Reggio Emilia (July, 1912), has been in the hands of the revolutionaries, who have never condemned the general strike, although there are various opinions in their ranks upon its value and applicability. We see the principal cause for the effective conduct of the [last] general strike in the quick and energetic action of the party executive and the Federation, which gave the order for the general strike scarcely 30 hours after the bloodshed, just as in the year 1904, when

the movement attained similar depth and power. . . . Besides, the masses had for some time been filled with the thought of a general strike, were inwardly prepared for it, and their élite was not held back through all kinds of considerations and prudence, as in the reformistic era, considerations which arose from the anxiety not to destroy a *political* situation favorable for the masses.

"We will not deny that the widespread unemployment . . . also favored the strike. . . .

"Now as to the result of the general strike. Before one can judge this question, one must be clear as to the purpose of the general strike. The general strike was a protest against a deed of violence, which the Italian proletariat could in no way justify or accept. Accordingly, it wanted to show the bourgeoisie that while it might allow its police and carabinieri to fire upon the people without legal warning, that the masses, through their cessation of labor, can obstruct the whole operation of bourgeois life and injure bourgeois interests. Naturally the working-class, by this line of action, cuts into its own flesh. If the general strike interferes with the profit and convenience of the bourgeoisie, it often deprives the proletariat of daily necessities. Certainly there is a tremendous eloquence in the sudden stopping of production, and of public services. There is never a clearer understanding of what the proletariat creates than on the day when it folds its arms. But it cannot be doubted that the proletariat itself makes the greatest economic sacrifice in a general strike. Besides the dead and wounded, the imprisoned are solely on the side of the workers. Regarded as a calculation, the gain in the general strike is never on the side of the proletariat. To the victims against whose death the protest is made are always added other victims. . . . The general strike is no compensation for a wrong that has been suffered, and is

not intended as such. It is an expression of power in opposition to another expression of power. It does not bring immediate fruits, is no rational expression of strength, if one regards a short period only. It gives the proletariat the feeling of its own power and responsibility, and shows the bourgeoisie the limit of theirs. Besides, it permits experience to be gained for the final, decisive struggle with which the capitalistic society may turn into a Socialistic society. From this point of view we can no more regard its victims as serving no purpose than the bourgeoisie regard the accidents at its military maneuvers as being useless. . . .

“A word on the excesses. On the whole there were few acts of violence: a few attacks on persons, and damage to property of little importance for a movement which shook the greater part of the country. For two or three days the total reckoning of acts of violence which were given in the bourgeois press is short and unimportant. It must be recalled that in this strike the bourgeois resistance was for the first time organized and proceeded with incredible violence under the protection of the police. When these bourgeois rowdies could find an isolated worker, they drove the secret police against him, who arrested him with blows and kicks. . . .

“If one wishes to learn a strategical lesson from the conduct of the general strike, it is this: that for a complete development of power, the possession of the telegraph and telephone service is indispensable. This is a weighty problem of the general strike, because it is here the question of the maintenance of a service and not its discontinuance. This time, too, the Government cut the strikers off from all telegraph and telephone service. The party executive was fully twenty-four hours without any news. The lack of news from one town to another prevented simultaneous action,

and did not allow the masses to become aware of the greatness of the movement. Besides, orders given by the organization through signals are exceptionally important for Italy, where the general strike movement will doubtless be repeated. To-day party comrades do not dare to oppose any stupid vandalism, because they fear to be taken for police in civil clothes. Indeed several shots were fired at Comrade Peraccina, professor of pathology in the University of Florence, when he tried to mediate in a struggle at a barricade. The man later wrote to Peraccina that he had taken him for a secret policeman. Finally the councils of labor . . . had to undertake the issuing of a bulletin. In Rome there were no newspapers for three days. . . .

“On the whole, one can say that this general strike confirmed the experience gained in the previous ones: as it embraced a great part of the masses and interrupted labor in the whole country, it was a fearful expression of power and a stirring means of protest. Naturally one may regard it as an error to stir up the fear of the proletariat among the bourgeoisie, and to show one’s power, because this necessarily has the effect of arousing the bourgeoisie to defense. . . .

“As to the railroad strike we can be very brief. The movement failed, and failed under conditions which allowed it to be seen beforehand that it could not result otherwise. It was proclaimed, after the rest of the working-class had already been twenty-four hours on strike, and under the expressed supposition that this general strike would go beyond the bounds of a mere demonstration of protest. We do not hesitate to say its proclamation was an error due to a false judgment of the situation. Besides the railroad workers, whose very strong organization is under a Syndicalist leadership, have hitherto gained no great name for themselves in the field of sym-

pathetic strikes. If they struck, it was always for profit to their own profession.

“The movement in Romagna puts the person who must write about it under the painful necessity of finding his way among a mass of unconnected and contradictory reports, among which it is difficult to separate the true from the false. We shall merely indicate the essential characteristics of the movement. . . . This district is primarily an agricultural district. . . . Its population . . . was persuaded, on the 8th of June, from Ancona, to proclaim the republic everywhere, [on the supposition that] this had already happened in all the rest of Italy. The news was not doubted and no resistance was offered. They even placed the red flag in place of the flag of the monarchy. In the little places the carabinieri were disarmed or shut up in the barracks, local governments were constituted, the means of existence were distributed, reforms in local taxation laid out, etc. Because all this, on account of its lack of success, was afterwards turned into a farce, it is not worth while to dwell upon it. What is worthy of observation is only the great susceptibility of the masses to illusions, and their wonderful moderation which kept them from all acts of violence against persons and all useless destruction. That the telegraph and telephone were made unserviceable and the railroads blocked lay in the nature of the case and cannot be called vandalism. The June days showed that the population of Romagna and the Marches is enthusiastically ready to raise the Republican flag . . . without accompanying the change by orgies of revenge and without expecting enrichment from it. The absence of any act of revenge is all the more remarkable, as there exists in many places the greatest bitterness between workers and landlords, as the result of the obstinate economic struggles of recent years. [The strike in these

districts sometimes involved several hundred thousand agricultural laborers.]

“The June days further prove that the ruling class in Romagna and the Marches made their peace with what they supposed to be the new government without any effort at defense. The monarchy appeared to the bourgeoisie of those places as really not worth lifting a hand for. If it has become anti-Republican now that the hour of reaction has struck, that undoubtedly shows its lack of character, but not its monarchical sentiment.

“Of the June days it may truly be said that they showed the true marks of a political revolution, because in this period political power passed from one class of the population to another. The Republican committee gave orders and the bourgeoisie obeyed: delivered up cereals, handed over their automobiles, even offered money which was refused. The affair turned into a farce, not because it passed without bloodshed, but because the presupposition that a revolution had been accomplished in all the rest of the country proved false. That the masses, without meeting resistance, hauled down the royal colors in a hundred places, and replaced them with the red flag, is a much more significant fact to the monarchy [precisely] because it was accomplished without bloodshed, and because there was no resistance from the ruling classes.

“Our party had nothing to do with the movement in Romagna, though it could not refuse to give its sympathy to the child-like revolutionary idealism manifested there, nor refuse its support to those persecuted on account of this movement. It was a republican movement in a population which had thought republican for generations. No Socialist fighters and no Socialist goal. For us [it was] a trial of strength which did not take into account the powers of resistance of present society, and which was

aimed at a goal which was not worth a serious effort. We can rejoice because of the revolutionary spirit which came to life, but cannot be proud of it as a fruit of our party activity: the lesson of these days is rather a serious warning for our party. It shows valuable material which our party has not yet won and cultivated.”

VII. THE RUSSIAN GENERAL STRIKE OF JULY, 1914.

(From the New York *Volkszeitung*)

“At the beginning of the movement, the workers, incited by the bloodshed at the Putiloff works, in which 50 were injured and 4 killed, entered upon a three-day protest strike at the call of the active organizations. But the masses were so bitterly provoked by the actions of the police and Cossacks that the decision of the executive councils of the leading parties to end the strike on the evening of July 20—which, however, was kept from the general mass as a result of the confiscation of the two Social Democratic papers—secured no hearing. Until this time the streets of St. Petersburg were thronged with peacefully demonstrating workers who, when President Poincaré passed by, cried, ‘Long live the Republic! Amnesty! Down with autocracy! Long live liberty!’ Then, inflamed to the greatest fury by the attacks of the police and Cossacks, the strikers erected barricades on July 21 in various public places. For the first time since its founding, the Russian capital saw huge barricades spring up, behind which the workmen, armed with stones, sought shelter from the assaulting Cossacks.

“The fiercest conflicts occurred on the nights and days of July 22 and 23. Several thousand workmen took part in these fights. From most of the barricades—consisting for the most part of telephone and telegraph poles, over-

turned carts, and stone piles—red flags were seen fluttering. Women and children helped with the building of the barricades. Broken up by the police, the masses of men reassembled at different points in order to take up the fight anew. The police and military volleyed fiercely upon the crowds until, after a time, it became impossible to count the dead and wounded.

“During the week, according to the report of the factory inspection committee, over two hundred thousand workmen took part in the strike in St. Petersburg alone (which falls somewhat short of the true number). . . . Even a portion of the street railway men and of the shop employees of several railroads ceased work. Only the presence of numerous troops and gendarmes prevented the most important roads from taking part in the strike. The extent and strength of the movement may be shown further by the fact that the marine barracks were watched by armed soldiers to prevent the sailors housed in them from going over to the strikers.”

VIII. THE GENERAL STRIKE IN NEW ZEALAND, 1913

By Prof. J. E. Le Rossignol

(From *American Economic Review*, 1914)

“The trouble began in Wellington with a minor dispute concerning traveling pay between the Union Steamship Company and about a dozen members of the Shipwrights’ Union, a branch of the Wellington Waterside Workers’ Union, which itself was affiliated with the United Federation of Labor and had canceled its registration under the Arbitration Act. The Shipwrights’ Union went on strike on October 18. The Waterside Workers decided to call a special ‘stop-work’ meeting on the wharf at eight o’clock on the morning of October 22 to consider the grievances of

the shipwrights. The 'stop-work' meeting was held, as announced, and lasted about two hours. When the men went back to work some of them found other union men working on their jobs, whereupon the executive of the union demanded that the late-comers be reinstated forthwith. The shipping companies refused to do this, and the strike was called. The control of the strike was then placed in the hands of the executive of the United Federation of Labor, as provided in the constitution.

"In support of their refusal to obey the dictates of the union, the employers took the ground that the agreement under which the men had been working had been broken and was therefore void. . . . The employers claimed also that as the union was not registered under the Arbitration Act the agreement had no binding force. They objected, also, to dealing with the Federation, as that organization was in principle opposed to agreements, and as some of the leaders, notably the secretary, Mr. P. Hickey, had often used strong language in condemning them.

"By the end of October there were over 5,000 watersiders on strike in the various ports, while disorders were increasing and disturbance to trade was becoming daily more serious; but at the same time large bodies of special constables were encamped on the outskirts of several towns, waiting until they had sufficient force to take possession of the wharves. At Wellington, on November 5, a thousand special police rode down to the railway wharf from their camp at Mount Cook to protect a shipment of race horses, and on the way sustained a fierce attack from a mob of strikers and their sympathizers throwing stones, bricks, and other missiles. The police charged the mob several times, and the affray was very serious, resulting in about thirty casualties. On the next day the police once more surrounded the

wharves; there was no further resistance, and regular work was begun by a new union registered under the Arbitration Act, assisted by some of the seamen. The new union began with 47 members, but before the end of the strike more than 2,000 were enrolled, chiefly farmers.

"The course of events was very similar at Auckland, where, on November 8, a force of over 1,000 police occupied the waterfront. As a protest against the use of the special police, the Federation ordered a general strike in Auckland, and on Monday, November 10, the strike leaders claimed that 14 unions, involving 7,500 workers, were idle. Later the seamen also went on strike, bringing the total up to 8,000 or more.

"In opposition to the stand of the employers, the workers, while admitting a minor breach of agreement, claimed that this did not involve the abrogation of the agreement. They refused to have anything to do with the Arbitration Court and demanded unconditional reinstatement. They called the affair a lockout, rather than a strike, and designated the employers' actions as 'sheer pin-pricking.' They claimed that the employers had no right to compel them to register, as the act itself did not do so but was merely a permissive statute. Mass meetings were held; violent speeches were made by some of the labor leaders; there was some violence and much intimidation; and for some days the wharves were in the hands of the strikers and practically all the shipping was tied up.

"The attitude of the Government was very firm, and it was determined to maintain order at any cost. On October 25 the commissioner of police issued a call for volunteers to enroll as special constables. The call received immediate response from clerks, civil servants, and other young men of the cities, but especially from the country people; and

presently hundreds of mounted farmers were riding toward Wellington to enroll as special constables and to break the strike by acting as volunteer wharf laborers. The farmers were threatened with serious losses because of the stoppage of transportation at the beginning of summer, and were determined to protect themselves to the best of their ability, following the example of the 'Free Labor Brigade' of Sweden, which did so much to break the general strike of 1909. . . .

"Only the drivers came out in Wellington. The strike was at no time very serious in Dunedin, where the regular police were able to keep order. The port of Lyttelton was closed until November 18, when work was resumed with the members of a new union under the protection of a large force of special constables. The strike was more general on the West Coast, where the mines and sawmills were closed for many weeks and industry was at a standstill.

"The following estimate of the number of unionists and strikers was given by the *Wellington Evening Post* on November 20, and is probably fairly accurate:

Number of Strikers

Seamen	2,000
Miners	4,000
Watersiders	5,000
Other unions	5,000
<hr/>	
Total	16,000

"From these figures it is evident that the strikers constituted a small minority of all union workers. There are about 71,600 union laborers among the 300,000 wage-earners, male and female, in New Zealand; of these, 60,600 have accepted the act. Because of the large bodies of special constables at all important points, there was little

violence after the early outbreaks, and merely a 'strike of folded arms,' which practically failed within a week of the general call. Presently it was found that the strike funds were running low, and some unions were ordered back to work that they might contribute to the support of the rest. On November 23 the general strike was called off at Auckland, leaving only the transportation section still out.

"The seamen's strike was officially declared off on December 19, and on the same day it was decided to call off the strike for all other workers, except the miners, as from Saturday, December 20. The seamen were to renew their agreement for a period of three years, the Auckland branch to remain registered and the Wellington and Dunedin branches to register under the Arbitration Act. The watersiders at all the ports immediately flocked back to the wharves, asking to be enrolled in the new unions, all of which were registered. Work at the Huntly mine was resumed on January 6, 1914, with a new union of over one hundred members, under the protection of the police, and on January 10 the old unionists voted to join the new union. A few days later the workers in the state mine agreed to go back under the act, as also did the miners at Blackball, and the great strike was ended."

CHAPTER III

THE COMPULSORY ARBITRATION OF LABOR DISPUTES

THE Socialist parties of the Continent of Europe and of America are practically unanimous against all forms of compulsory arbitration of labor disputes. But the Labor parties of Australia and New Zealand have been largely instrumental in introducing the system prevailing in those countries, and there has been a very great disagreement on the subject also among British labor-unionists. We therefore give a résumé of the last discussion of this subject by the British Labor Party, as well as a typical résumé, from a Socialist source, of the situation in New Zealand, where the system was first introduced.

I. DISCUSSION AT CONFERENCE OF BRITISH LABOR PARTY, 1913

Mr. H. Skinner (Typographical Association) moved the following:

That, in the opinion of this Conference, rates of wages, the regulation of hours, and other conditions embodied in agreements of a local, district, or national character, voluntarily entered into between trade-unions as representing the workers and the representatives of employers in a given industry, should be legally enforceable on all persons employing labor in that industry; and the executive committee is hereby instructed to take action accordingly. . . .

Mr. Skinner declared that some such measure was necessary to compel the recalcitrant employer to enforce an

agreement; that the trade-unions were able to enforce a disciplinary influence on their membership, but that the employers could not exercise the same influence on their members. The details of the law, he believed, could safely be left to the Labor parliamentary group. He denied that the proposal was in the nature of compulsory arbitration.

Mrs. Webb [Fabian Society] ventured to ask the Conference not to pass the resolution because it contained two dangerous principles. In the first place, if an agreement was imposed upon the employers, it must be imposed upon the workmen too. If it was enforced in this way, it was enforced as a maximum as well as a minimum. The whole principle of factory legislation and of wages boards was that the regulation enforced was a minimum and not a maximum, and it was competent for any employer to give more than was laid down by the regulation, and it was also competent for any workman to strike for more than was laid down. Therefore the weapon of the strike was kept intact as well as having the advantage of legal enactment. The resolution did not follow that principle. It concerned private agreements between employers and employed. As the state had not been called in, it could only be enforced as a civil liability by an action for damages. The workers would then find themselves in the position of the New Zealand workers who were being imprisoned for refusing to obey the court. The only way of dealing with the question of wages in a quite safe manner so that the weapon of the strike could be kept intact and be always ready for use, was to proceed by the wages boards by which a minimum and not a maximum was laid down. She suggested that the resolution should be rejected.

Mr. J. R. Clynes, M. P. [Gas-workers] declared that the two objections he had to the proposal were that it was too premature and that it would give to non-unionists condi-

tions which the unionists had fought and paid for. The resolution had nothing to do with the right to strike or compulsory arbitration. He did not believe that one needed to fear that the industrial council wished to abolish the strike or interfere with industrial freedom of the workers.

The resolution was withdrawn, as many expressed a desire to give further and closer consideration to the principles involved.

II. THE EXPERIENCE WITH COMPULSORY ARBITRATION IN NEW ZEALAND

By Robert H. Hutchinson

(From *The New Review*, January, 1910)

“Under what favorable conditions the system of arbitration was inaugurated in New Zealand must be borne in mind at the outset. Prior to its inception the country had been under the thumb of the large farmer, a condition which continued until a coalescence of the small farmers and the laboring men of the towns effected, in 1890, the overthrow of the Conservatives and the entrance of a Liberal Party into Parliament. Now, although a protective tariff stood behind the manufacturer, the worker and farmer controlled the Government, and together they regarded the manufacturer and commercial man as their antagonist. The country was limited, its exports in the way of manufactures practically nothing, and its population small and homogeneous. There was no ‘rabble’ of unemployed, labor was scarce, of a high order, and valuable, and the tariff wall enabled the manufacturer to shift any additional expense resulting from legislative pressure on to the consumer. Add to this the fact that beginning in the later ’90’s a wave of commercial prosperity swept the

country, and it must be granted that New Zealand's position was somewhat ideal for the institution of a court of arbitration. On the whole, the idea was acceptable. Farmers looked to it as one instrument among others to curb the arrogance of the manufacturers; workers saw in it a means of improving their lot; and even the employers welcomed it as a medium for settling disputes and were glad to grant concessions to their employees for the benefits which would accrue from industrial peace.

"It would be futile to delay in criticising the sundry benefits and drawbacks which have resulted from the arbitration law in New Zealand. Undoubtedly it has benefited the progressive employer by eliminating the cutthroat competitors who reap their profits through sweating and child labor. Great educative benefits also have resulted from the necessary publicity accompanying an award, and the popular criticism to which the court was continuously exposed. The worker, of course, has profited greatly. It has meant for him not only increase of [money] wages and improved conditions under which to work, but additional leisure and independence as well. But, on the other hand, employers have complained that labor has decreased in its efficiency, and other critics fear that though it has helped to unite and solidify labor in general, it has taken the steel out of the men and left them without initiative. Meanwhile the public complains that prices have gone up and the investor declares his capital in danger.

"The attitude of the workers has of recent years radically changed. Whereas ten years ago the voices foretelling the failure of the court were very few indeed and ill received, the opinion is growing prevalent that they were the voices of true and not false prophets. In fact, to support the Arbitration Court among some labor circles

to-day is tantamount to declaring oneself a reactionary. Men and women among the workers feel that the court is owned and controlled by the capitalist class; that though their labor representative is a factor of it, yet he is counterbalanced by the employers' representative, and the judge, being also a member of the Supreme Court, belongs by his training and social affiliations to the other class, and is unavoidably biased. Whereas a few years ago contrary opinion was directed against the personnel and practice of the court, it is to-day resolving itself into a belief that the basic principle of arbitration is at fault. Furthermore, the court must act within laws enacted by a capitalist-controlled Parliament, and to plead before it under such circumstances is a hopeless predicament. Public opinion behind the court forbids it, in fact, to act in any other but according to the most conventional conceptions of justice. During the last few years the tendency of the court has been to regard the workers as a discontented class revolting against a perfectly satisfactory order of things, and upon whom the court must pass sentence. The reputation for industrial well-being which New Zealand enjoys makes it additionally difficult. One hears it said, 'the workers here are better off than in any other country in the world; they have no right to complain.'

"It is impossible for the judges to act impartially; they are too much restricted on every side, the pressure of the capitalist class too great. . . .

"The court is no longer the focussing point of public interest in industrial matters. It is no longer the axle around which turn the wheels of business life. Differences between employers and workers are settled to an ever increasing extent outside the court, and, moreover, force is again being called into play. Workers are resorting to the strike. Employers, however, cling to the system and

use it in a previously unnecessary way. When a union failing of its purpose before the court, cancels its registration and declares a strike, the employers rush in a squad of men, pay them good wages for the time being, form them into an arbitration union upon a program dictated by themselves [the employers], and, before the strikers know it, they must either join the new union at the employers' pleasure or go without work. This procedure has been a feature of almost every recent strike and was notoriously so during the late crisis. . . .

"Such is the practical outcome; other inevitable results are no less in evidence. Though wages have risen since the inception of the act, prices have gone up in much greater proportion, and the wage-earner finds himself in no better position to-day than twenty years ago. In other respects New Zealand has progressed along substantially the same path as have other countries. Wealth has become more and more concentrated into the hands of the few, poverty is slowly but surely on the increase, and class distinctions are becoming each day more pronounced. With the tendency of business towards monopoly and the inevitable rise in the cost of living, labor is awakening, uniting, and demanding its just share of what it produces. The effect of these twenty years of arbitration and good times has been merely to lull the worker into a comfortable and self-satisfied condition until he felt himself quite as good as his employer. He had but to step up to the Arbitration Court and his demands materialized. He had leisure, comfort, and good pay. But to-day he feels that all these years he has been fooled and cheated and the court seems a very grim joke indeed."

(See also "New Zealand" and "The General Strike.")

III. COMPULSORY ARBITRATION IN AUSTRALIA

Editorials in *The Socialist* (Melbourne), signed by Mordecai

[Both in New South Wales and in Western Australia—as in other instances—officials put in office by the Labor Party had fined labor unionists for striking.]

“These workers are brought before the court just in the same way as the person who commits any common offense, and for what? They withhold the labor which they have to sell. It seems that we are drifting back to conditions of slavery. When the worker may be fined or jailed for exercising what should be his right under capitalism—to say when and for whom he will work—he is a slave indeed. The official who summoned these men to appear at court was elected to look after working-class interests. That is how he does it. We compliment him (and his party) on the success of his efforts to fool the workers. In passing, it is interesting to note that the leader of the Federal Labor Party is of the same mind as his state brothers. Speaking in the House of Representatives on Thursday, April 16, Mr. Fisher said: ‘If I could, I would prevent strikes absolutely.’ So would we, by abolishing the social system which makes them necessary. At present the strike is the only way for the workers effectually to express their discontent. Anyone who would prevent them doing that is assisting the other class to keep the working-class in the bondage of wage-slavery.”

(See also “Australia.”)

CHAPTER IV

THE SOCIALIST PROGRAM OF LABOR LEGISLATION AND SOCIAL REFORM

ALL the Socialist and Labor parties and other labor union organizations have concentrated a large part of their activity, undoubtedly the larger part, in the effort to secure labor legislation. We make no attempt to measure the success of this effort, as this would require a volume in itself. Moreover, it is difficult to say in what proportion the legislation already secured is to be attributed to the enlightened selfishness of governments actually in power, and to what extent it is to be attributed to their fear of the economic or political power of the labor unions and Socialist parties.

It is perfectly practicable, however, to give the Socialist program of labor legislation, as well as the British variation of this program.

I. PROGRAM OF COPENHAGEN CONGRESS, 1910

The International Congress, held at Copenhagen in 1910, adopted a resolution on labor legislation, declaring that:

The increasing exploitation of the workers consequent upon the development of capitalist production has brought about conditions which render imperative legislation for the protection of the life and health of the worker.

In no country do the laws even approximate that which is absolutely necessary in the interests of the workers, and which could be granted without detriment to existing industry; [and reiterating] the following minimum demands regarding legislation for

the protection of workers (without distinction of sex) made by the Paris Congress of 1889:

1. A maximum working day of eight hours.
2. Prohibition of boy and girl labor under 14 years.
3. Prohibition of night work, except where the nature of the work demands of public welfare make it inevitable.
4. Uninterrupted rest of at least 36 hours in each week for all workers.
5. Complete suppression of the truck system.
6. Absolute right of combination.
7. Effective and thorough inspection of working conditions, agricultural as well as industrial, with the co-operation of persons elected by the workers.

The Congress recalled the action of the Amsterdam Congress (1904) in demanding that adequate public measures be taken "for the support and care of the sick, those disabled by accident, the old, the invalids, women with child and mothers in childbed, widows, orphans, and the unemployed; the administration of such measures to be under the control of the workers, and the same treatment to be given to foreigners as to those belonging to the country," and called "upon the workers of all nations, whether occupied in industry, in commerce, in agriculture, or in any other branch, to break down the opposition of the governing classes and, by unceasing agitation and strong and perfect organization, both political and industrial, to win for themselves real and effective protection."

II. RESOLUTION AT THE BRITISH LABOR PARTY CONFERENCE ON THE NATIONAL MINIMUM, 1913

(Conference of 1913)

Mr. W. C. Anderson [I. L. P.] moved the following:

That this Conference urges the Parliamentary Labor Party to press upon the Government the resolutions carried at the many

War Against Poverty Conferences demanding legislation next session to secure to every person a national minimum of civilized life by measures providing for a legal minimum wage in agriculture and all industries, the reduction of the hours of labor to 48 hours per week, complete provision against sickness, the guarantee of a national minimum of child nurture, the prevention of unemployment, the building of healthy homes for all, and the abolition of the Poor Law.

Mr. Anderson of the Independent Labor Party and W. S. Sanders of the Fabian Society urged a union of all forces to bring about this reform. The resolution was carried.

III. PUBLIC FEEDING OF SCHOOL CHILDREN

(Conference of 1914)

Dr. Marion Phillips (Women's Labor League) moved the following:

That this Conference calls upon the Government to make compulsory the Education (Provision of Meals) Act, and to extend it so that necessitous children may be fed during holidays and to make it obligatory that feeding should be carried out by direct management and not by contractors.

She said the greater part of the resolution had been carried at previous conferences. The only new point was that they wished to make it obligatory for feeding to be carried out by direct management and not by private contractors making a profit out of the business.

The resolution was seconded and agreed to.

(See also party programs of Germany and the United States.)

CHAPTER V

UNEMPLOYMENT

THE question of unemployment plays a very exceptional and central rôle from the point of view of all Socialist parties. The chief reason for this is that if there were not always present in industry an army of unemployed, strikes would be far more effective. Not only would this make possible such a high degree of organization of labor as to facilitate the general strike, but it would also put the labor unions in a position to wage a much more effective political struggle.

I. THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF COPENHAGEN, 1910

(From American Party Report)

The resolution and discussion on the problems of unemployment and co-operation and on the Socialist program for labor legislation we take from the report of the Congress, made by the American delegates to the American Party.

The following is the resolution on the question of unemployment:

The Congress declares that unemployment is inseparable from the capitalist mode of production and will disappear only when capitalism disappears. So long as capitalist production forms the basis of society, palliative measures alone are possible.

This Congress demands the institution by public authorities, under the administration of working-class organizations, of general compulsory insurance against unemployment, the expenses of which shall be borne by the owners of the means of production.

The representatives of the workers most urgently demand from the public authorities:

- (1) Exact statistical registration of the unemployed.
- (2) The execution on a sufficient scale of important public works where the unemployed shall be paid the trade-union rate of wages.
- (3) In periods of industrial crisis extraordinary subsidies to trade-union unemployed funds.
- (4) No payment to an unemployed worker to cause the loss of political rights.
- (5) Establishment of and subsidies to labor exchanges in which all the liberties and interest of the workers are respected by co-operation with trade-union employment bureaus.
- (6) Social laws for the regulation and reduction of hours of work.
- (7) Pending the realization by legislation of general and compulsory insurance, the public authorities should encourage unemployment benefit funds of trade-unions by financial subsidies, these subsidies leaving complete autonomy to the trade-union.

II. THE GERMAN CONGRESS OF 1913

a. *Edmondo Peluso, in L'Humanité*

The Congress of the German Socialist Party in 1913 was of the unanimous opinion that unemployment is a consequence of the capitalist system of exploitation and can be eradicated only by the abolition of the present society. But palliatives can be employed and the duty of the Socialist Party is to see that this is done. Comrade Timm, Socialist representative in the Bavarian Diet, in his report on the unemployment insurance law, said in part:

The first thing to do is to prevent the capitalists in such critical time from lowering existing salaries. The second step is for the Government, through an insurance law, to help the unemployed.

The German syndicates, in 1912, gave nearly nine million marks for the unemployed out of their funds.

The landowners are opposed to such a law, and demand that the unemployed be sent to the farms, where hands are scarce.

In Denmark, such an insurance law exists, and the state and the communes have to pay 10,000,000 marks yearly for this purpose.

In England, about 2,500,000 workers are compulsorily insured.

In Germany, we must compel the bourgeoisie, through the union of our forces, to grant us this reform law.

The motion of Timm was then adopted unanimously.

b. *The Timm Resolution*

The constant and periodically growing problem of unemployment is an inseparable feature, an inevitable result of capitalist production. It will disappear only with the introduction of a socially organized system of production.

But we must strive, even under present conditions, at least to alleviate the suffering caused by unemployment through social legislation.

We demand, therefore, that all public bodies of the nation, states, or cities insist upon immediate completion of unfinished public undertakings and plan for the systematic provision of opportunity for work at the prevailing rate of wages.

We call upon organizations to arrange mass demonstrations which shall emphasize and support the measures proposed by their representatives in the legislative bodies.

Public legal unemployment insurance for all workers and employees can be established only by national legislation.

Until such time as the national regulation of unemployment insurance has been secured, we demand municipal support through payments to the labor-union unemployment insurance funds.

For this purpose the individual states must be called upon to grant regular endowments.

The enforcement of public unemployment insurance legislation is possible only when it is demanded by active and energetic agitation through our political and industrial organizations. We call upon all workers, therefore, to join these organizations.

III. THE OFFICIAL REPORT TO THE PROPOSED VIENNA CONGRESS, 1914

The report on unemployment to the proposed International Congress, which was to have been held at Vienna in

1914, was intrusted by the International Bureau to Vaillant, and was unanimously indorsed by the French Congress. It was practically certain of adoption by the Congress at Vienna, had the latter been held. A summary was given in *The Daily Herald* (London).

Vaillant declared that capitalism will have recourse to the aid of the state in order to provide that reserve army of labor which it requires and must have. It will promote emigration or immigration, or try to stop both according as the reserve army of labor rises or falls.

He then reviewed the manner in which the various European countries were encouraging and suppressing immigration and emigration, and analyzed the crises which had taken place during the last twenty years.

He then proposed the following resolution, which was to be submitted to the Vienna Congress:

The Congress—Considering that if unemployment can only disappear with the method of capitalist production for which it is a necessary condition of existence and development, there are laws, reforms, and means which even now can prevent or mitigate in some measure misery and suffering and their aggravation in times of depression and crisis;

Considering that the evil of unemployment presses not only on those out of work, but unceasingly threatens all members of the working-class and makes the whole of working-class life a long torture of insecurity and dread; that, therefore, the first and most necessary measures against unemployment and its evils are those which best protect the workers, guarantee their security, and increase the power of organization, the resistance and struggle of the working-class [demands]:

1. The extension of the right of trade-union combination;
2. Limitation of the duration and intensity of labor—the eight-hour day and the “English week” (Saturday half-holiday); physiological and hygienic limitation of the intensity and rapidity of labor;
3. Fixing a trade-union rate of wages, a minimum wage according to the cost of living;

4. The Australian system of a minimum wage and wages boards for housework and low-paid callings;

5. Prohibition of all production of commodities by labor in prisons and benevolent establishments; educational work to be substituted in them for productive work;

6. Systematic co-ordination and execution of public works in accordance with the economic situation, the state of the markets, and the intensity of unemployment;

7. Institution of a national organization of the service of "placement," under the control of the state and the trade-unions;

8. Social insurance against all the risks of working-class life and labor—unemployment, accidents, sickness, invalidity, infirmity, old age, etc.—without workmen's contributions, and managed, quite independently, by the unions of those insured;

Insurance guaranteeing to all those insured reparation for risks undergone, compensation to be at least equal to the proved loss of working capacity or wages;

Establishment of all institutions and measures useful for the prevention of risks;

Graduated tax upon capital and incomes of the wealthy classes, the provision, by an annual credit in the budget, of necessary and sufficient sums for the complete working and development of social insurance; the capital funds from the employers' contributions furnishing useful complementary sums;

9. Permanent and periodical inquiry into unemployment by trade-unions with the co-operation, if possible, of the technical services of the communes and the state.

CHAPTER VI

THE HIGH COST OF LIVING

IN the chapter on the Socialist parties and the labor unions we have pointed out that the Socialist parties often regard themselves merely as the political expression of the organizations of the largest class of producers, the wage-earners. But all producers are at the same time consumers, and all Socialist parties have given a constantly increasing share of their attention to the problems of the consumer. Frequently, in recent years, it has even appeared in some of the countries of continental Europe that the Socialist parties have been giving more attention to the high cost of living than to strikes, labor legislation, and other matters which concern the wage-earners as producers.

But this is a comparatively new development; as a consequence, the Socialist position is not altogether defined; for example, the International has not decided whether any effort shall be made to fix prices by law. Our quotations, therefore, while not indicating any final conclusions, cover the more important part of the period (the years since 1910) during which this topic has been the center of discussion. It is hardly necessary to add that prices have never risen so rapidly as in recent years, and that in all countries they have gone up far more rapidly than wages—with the exception of a few favorably situated occupations. Hence the growing importance of the agitation, which led to widespread rioting in many of the continental nations—including France, Italy, Germany, and Austro-Hungary.

I. THE BRITISH LABOR PARTY CONFERENCE, 1914—STATE
REGULATED PRICES

(From the Official Report of the Conference)

Mr. O. Connellan [Leeds Trades Council] moved the following:

That this Conference is of opinion that the time is opportune for steps to be taken to inquire into the possibility of the establishment of state-regulated prices for domestic commodities, as a national correlative to the minimum wage.

He said they did not hope the Labor Party would be able to secure in the immediate future or for some time the state regulation of prices of food, but the fact remained that the supply of food, being in the hands of a few rich merchants, they had the power to fix their own prices. He felt that it was a matter the Labor Party ought to take up.

The resolution was formally seconded.

Mr. D. J. Davies [Vehicle Workers] moved the following amendment:

Delete "as a national correlative to the minimum wage" and insert "and other commodities which are compulsory purchasable by the workers in the course of their occupation."

He said the matter he wished included was a very important one for the members of his society. Oil fuel was under two companies, and at the commencement of 1913 those companies raised the price of petrol to such an extent that it cost the union thousands of pounds to fight the employers on behalf of the taxi-cab drivers of London. . . .

Mr. J. Ramsay MacDonald, M. P., said that when they started laying down the policy of a minimum wage those who had taken the trouble to think the matter out in detail saw they would have to go farther. Australia had had to go farther. The prices of certain commodities in Australia

were now fixed by the state. They were bound to go from one stage to another. There was no termination in this method of progress. He thought the cab-drivers had not raised a small point at all. The question of oil fuel, its monopoly, its control, its management, and its cost, was going to be one of the biggest economic problems that the industrial world would have to face. He therefore hoped the amendment would be accepted.

The amendment was put and declared carried; and the resolution as amended was then agreed to.

II. THE FRENCH PARTY CONGRESS, 1914

(From *Le Peuple* of Brussels)

The report to the French Congress (on the "High Cost of Living") was introduced by the well-known Marxist and agricultural economist, Compère-Morel. In his report, general as well as specific causes were ascribed as reasons for the increased cost of living. Thus while militarism, taxation, emigration, and fluctuations in the price of gold undoubtedly play some part in this increase, nevertheless the root-evil must be sought in the capitalistic system itself. The consumer is helpless against trusts and combinations, and the Socialistic organization alone can relieve the body politic from the ruinous opposition of the interests of the producers and consumers.

Vaillant gave importance to the secondary causes, such as the tariff on consumption goods. He favored a policy of commercial treaties with Germany, which the German and Austrian Socialists had formulated. Adolph Braun proposed labor-union control of wages and their regulation *in correspondence with the prices of necessary commodities.*

Guesde declared that no one had denied that the in-

creased cost of living was a general and universal condition. He concluded:

It prevails in protectionist as well as in free-trade countries; in those localities where there are trusts, as well as in those where there are none; in countries where union methods have been developed (Belgium, England, Germany, etc.), as well as in countries where they have not; it is found where there is no government, as well as in those countries where government has secured a foothold. From this it follows that the increase of prices is of an inherently capitalistic origin. Such being the case, how can we offer co-operation, government ownership, and free trade as the sole remedies? . . .

We must show the proletariat that it must employ every means—even the labor unions—if it is ever to prepare itself for its emancipation, but we must impress upon it just as firmly that the solution of this, as well as of other social problems, is connected inseparably with the overthrow of the capitalistic system. Carthage must be destroyed! Down with capitalism!

The following resolution was adopted:

In view of the fact that the cost of living has risen to such an extent that it is becoming impossible to live like human beings, since the increase of wages, which follows rather than precedes the crisis in the rise of prices, is often slower than the increased cost of living;

In view of the fact that this phenomenon, far from being peculiar to our nation, arises in every capitalistic country, protectionist or free trade, of the Old or New World, and occupies the minds of all proletarians of every country. And since the high cost of living is an evil of essentially capitalistic origin and cannot disappear save with capitalism itself;

Therefore, the Congress appeals to the workingmen and women of all countries, who suffer from the increased cost of living, to ally themselves with the Socialist Party and with the labor unions, thus strengthening the army of the proletariat that is consciously and effectively striving against the high cost of living.

The Congress invites them at the same time to make use of their political and economic powers:

(1) Replacing indirect taxes upon consumption by direct taxes

upon capital, accompanied by legislative measures checking the shifting of such taxes.

(2) Lessening the burden of public expenditure.

(3) Encouraging and developing the agricultural output.

(4) Placing a lower rate on the transportation of materials of primary importance for the development of the land and on the shipping of agricultural products.

(5) Regulating the prices of articles of principal importance (bread, meat, rent, etc.).

(6) Tariff duties, which, while not being exaggerated in the interest of protection, would take into account the legitimate interests of those developing the land.

(7) The development of co-operation, by which the consumer and producer can do away with the robbery that has been practiced on both by the middleman.

(8) Stopping the exodus from the country by applying labor legislation to the agricultural workers, by aiding the peasant producers through tax reforms, and by increasing the production of commodities through the medium of great public agricultural works.

(9) Limitation of armaments and abolition of war.

(10) Realizing the maximum of social reforms and labor legislation, so as to keep humanity from illness, crime, delinquency, insanity, alcoholism, and destitution.

III. THE WEBB REPORT—PREPARED FOR THE PROPOSED VIENNA INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS, 1914

While the International Socialist Congress proposed for Vienna on August 23, 1914, was never held, on account of the war, the report on the "High Cost of Living," which was to have been submitted to the Congress by Mr. Sidney Webb, has been obtained.

Mr. Webb, after analyzing the situation in various countries, significantly concluded that "it is melancholy reflection that, except in so far as the growing collectivism has been able to protect and supplement the workmen's standard of life, at least a majority of the families in the

world find themselves amid enormously augmented wealth, getting, in one or other item, actually less adequate food, clothing, housing, leisure, or recreation than was the case 20 years ago." He recommended, *on behalf of the British Section*, the adoption of the following resolution:

1. That the rise in prices, which has extended to nearly all commodities in every civilized country, and has continued already for 18 years, has practically nowhere been accompanied by an equivalent rise of money wages, and has consequently resulted, notwithstanding all the struggles of trade-union organizations, in a degradation in the standard of life of great masses of the proletariat.

2. That the fundamental cause of such a general rise of prices is to be sought in the growing command over the means and processes of production, and over the markets and methods of distribution, which the capitalists of the world are obtaining, by means of their monopolies, combinations, and price-agreements; by which, on the one hand, prices are raised to the consumer, and on the other hand—owing to the increased power which these same monopolies, combinations, and price-agreements give, in face of the proletarian competition for employment—the wages of labor are continually being driven down towards bare subsistence rates.

3. That this evil outcome of capitalist exploitation and the competitive wage-system accordingly demands the urgent consideration of every legislature; in order that, pending any complete grappling with the evil (which can only be accomplished by the transformation of society on a Socialist basis), palliative measures for the protection of the proletariat may everywhere be adopted.

4. Among the palliative measures to be commended as having, at any rate, a partial success, the Congress notes:

(a) The action of many municipalities in Germany, Hungary, Italy, and elsewhere in keeping down prices by opening municipal shops and bakeries, and supplying meat, fish, bread, etc., as well as medicines for the sick, at cost price.

(b) The development—unfortunately far too slow—of the municipal provision of dwelling houses to be let at the cost of construction and maintenance only.

(c) The growth in nearly all countries of the democratic co-

operative societies which bring an increasing part of the provisioning of the people under working-class control.

(d) The formulation of the demand by trade-unions that there should be recognized a minimum standard of wages below which they must never be allowed to fall, based on the ascertained cost of maintenance.

(e) The concessions—as yet tardy and insufficient—by public authorities of increases of wages to their employees, professedly in proportion to the increased cost of living.

And the working-class throughout the world should press such measures forward.

5. That in view of the increasing spread of the fixing of minimum rates of wages by law, by public authorities, or by collective agreements, and the consequent stereotyping for long periods of existing money rates of wages, it is desirable that *all such wage scales should be accompanied by provisions for the rates of wages to rise automatically with the general level of prices of commodities, which should be officially ascertained and promulgated year by year.* (Our italics.)

The last proposal would mark an extremely important, if not a revolutionary, innovation in Socialist and labor-union policy.

CHAPTER VII

AGRICULTURE

THE Socialist interest in agriculture is twofold: (1) the high cost of living is attributed chiefly to the high prices of agricultural products; and (2) the large class of agricultural laborers, and small agriculturists practically in the condition of agricultural laborers, must be won over to Socialism if there is to be a Socialist majority and a Socialist government.

The first phase of this question we have considered in the previous chapter. The importance of the second part of the problem has been recognized by all Socialist parties for many years, though in the early stages of the present Socialist movement very little attention was given to it. It will be noticed that the International movement had assumed no definite attitude to the agrarian question in 1896. But since that time the problem of gaining the agricultural vote for Socialism has been carefully considered not only in France, America, and Great Britain, but also in a number of the smaller countries, such as Belgium, Denmark, and Roumania, and in nearly all cases considerable success has already been achieved—though only a small beginning of what it is hoped to accomplish.

The agricultural problem, as a whole, has never been discussed at the International Socialist Congresses, and as a consequence the position of the various countries differs radically. But there is far less difference as to the high cost of living, and this latter problem has led all the

Socialist parties to certain common conclusions as to agriculture (as the previous chapter has shown).

It will also be seen that there is a great deal in common between the program of the Socialists of France and of America, the two great countries (together with Russia) where agriculture is most important.

I. THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF LONDON, 1896

The Congress of the International held at London in 1896 adopted the following resolution on the agrarian question:

The ever-increasing evils of the capitalist exploitation of agriculture will not completely disappear, except in a society in which the soil, as well as the other means of production, belong to the collectivity.

The modes of holding land and its distribution among the various categories of the agricultural population in different countries, present a diversity too great to allow of the adoption of a general formula, imposing on all labor parties the same means for realizing their common ideal, and applicable to all classes which are interested in their realization.

But every labor party has one essential and fundamental task: the organization of the rural proletariat against those who exploit it. Consequently the Congress declares that it must be left to the different nationalities to determine the means of action best adapted to the situation of each country.

II. OFFICIAL REPORT TO THE FRENCH PARTY CONGRESS OF 1912

By Compère-Morel

(From *Le Socialiste*, February 18 to 25, 1912)

The French Party has perhaps given more attention to the agricultural problem than any other large Socialist Party. Its chief expert and authority on the subject is

Compère-Morel. The following propositions presented by him to the Party Congress in 1912, though not finally acted upon, indicate the past progress of the party, its present agricultural problems, and the line of their probable solution:

Whereas, the agricultural wage-earners, deprived of their tools of production, are converted into proletarians to the same extent as are the wage-earners of mines, railroads, and factories, and are paid sub-human starvation wages;

Whereas, the tenant-farmers who till the soil which they do not own are scarcely less exploited by the great landowners than are the agricultural laborers;

Whereas, small proprietors working their land without the help of day laborers are exploited by the money-lenders, and fall more and more into absolute dependence upon middlemen, to whom they become increasingly tributary, and the small farmers are condemned to submit to their terms, whether it be a question of manure, seeds, agricultural machinery, or of agricultural products. In the meanwhile, they face the prospect of their real estate shrinking in value in competition with the large estates; . . .

Whereas, the whole world of rural labor, tenant-farmer and small landed proprietor, has every reason to desire to have that transformation realized which is the aim of International Socialism;

Therefore, the party should increase its propaganda in the country by organizing agricultural workers and, with their help, should hasten the *political* expropriation of the capitalist class, the indispensable prelude to its *economic* expropriation.

To this end, while reaffirming that the solution of the social problem lies wholly and exclusively in the collective ownership of all means of production, exchange, and distribution, the party should decide upon a series of immediate demands, calculated to prepare the French peasantry for the new order.

This series of immediate demands is as follows:

1. Development of the unions of agricultural laborers.
2. Extension of all labor laws to agriculture and a minimum wage for day-laborers, as well as those hired by the year, to be fixed by the agricultural unions and municipal councils.

3. Establishment of a normal eight-hour day. During the busy seasons, overtime allowed with special pay. Weekly rest to agricultural wage-earners.

4. Application of the laws of hygiene to the quarters of farm hands, to realize the maximum of favorable conditions.

5. Prohibition of child labor under 13 years of age, and the farmwork for children and youths before 7 A.M. and after 7 P.M.

6. Appointment of agricultural arbitrators, with right of appeal reserved to the representatives of both parties.

7. Revision of ground leases for tenant-farming by arbitration committees, which, when the rent exceeded the normal ground rent, should reduce the rent charge to the normal price; and the institution of a rental varying according to the crops, inclemencies of the season, and prices. Indemnity to tenant-farmers when leaving, for the increased value given to the property during the lease.

8. The establishment for the farmer of a fund to include farming implements, manure, and heads of cattle which are indispensable to the exercise of the vocation.

9. Abolition of taxes of labor imposed by the proprietor upon the tenant-farmers and the abolition of landlord-tenants.

10. Development of agricultural unions, benefit, and co-operative societies, for the purpose, first, of purchasing fertilizer, seed, etc., then for the sale of agricultural products, and, lastly, for their production, the administration of which will permit the small landowners to accustom themselves to superior methods of management and the use of new agricultural instruments.

11. Purchase by the communes, with the aid of the state, of agricultural machines, or the hiring of these machines, placed without charge at the service of the small cultivators.

12. Abolition of inheritance taxes under 5,000 francs.

13. Abolition of all indirect taxes and transformation of direct taxes into a progressive tax on incomes above 3,000 francs; *ad interim*, the abolition of the ground tax, the proprietors cultivating their own lands.

14. Lowering of the transport rates for fertilizer machines and agricultural products.

15. Prohibition of the communes from alienating their communal lands.

16. Revision of the registry of lands and revision of lands subdivided by the communes.

17. Immediate consideration of some plan of public works having for its end the betterment of the soil and the development of agricultural production.

18. Freedom to hunt and fish, limited only by the necessities of conservation; prohibition of private preserves.

19. Free courses in agronomy, together with plots of land for experiment.

Therefore, be it resolved that the Lyons Congress vote this program of immediate reform, and declare to the farmers that we wish to restore the possessions of those that have been dispossessed and to respect the little farms of others which they have been cultivating themselves; that we nevertheless predict that they will voluntarily come to the collective form of property through the methods of co-operation, because they will have recognized all its advantages with their own eyes; that we believe that our recruits will be many, and that the reign of the agrarians, that reserve army of reaction and social conservatism, will be near its end.

III. THE PROGRAM ADOPTED BY THE DANISH CONGRESS, 1913

(From *Vorwaerts*)

The agrarian program demands the nationalization of the estates of the nobility, of the church, and of all uncultivated land. The right of eminent domain is extended. The use of socialized land is to be given to agricultural laborers and persons in a similar situation, the necessary capital for cultivation to be furnished when necessary by the community. Where co-operative cultivation is profitable it is to be encouraged by the community. Furthermore, the state is to support agriculture by furnishing capital for cultivation, to help in the improvement of the land, etc. The organization and support of agricultural schools are demanded. The state is to undertake and superintend the building of private dwellings and is to struggle against land speculation by itself building dwellings for

laborers. Where the right of using socially owned land is given over to private persons, a tax is to be fixed corresponding to the value of the land. Besides the tax against landowners, there is to be a taxing of the increment in land value.

IV. THE AGRARIAN QUESTION IN THE UNITED STATES *

1. RECENT TENDENCIES IN AGRICULTURAL CONCENTRATION

By A. M. Simons

Present-day American agriculture has grown directly out of conditions, most of which originated in the years directly after the Civil War. At this time the most extensive effort ever tried in any country was made to maintain a race of small farmers. In the 20 years following 1860, 65,000,000 acres of land were distributed by the national government in small farms. A much larger amount was given to the railroads during this same period, and a large portion of this was also distributed to small farmers.

In the South the great plantations were divided up by the destruction of the system of chattel slavery into hundreds of thousands more small farms.

In the intense competition for production of agricultural products that followed, *the income of the farmer, like that of the wage-worker, was reduced to the point which would sustain life and permit a continuance of the race of farmers. The remainder went to the transportation, storage, and marketing companies that control the farmers' product in its later stages.* (Our italics throughout article.)

By 1890 there were no more farms to be distributed, save in isolated localities or after the expenditure of large sums for drainage or irrigation. These were not numerous

* From *Socialist Party Campaign Book* of 1912.

enough or in sufficiently active connection with agriculture as a whole to act as an outlet for the farmers who were being crowded from the land in the older localities.

The 20 years since 1890 have seen the transformation of those conditions that have served to distinguish agriculture from factory industry. It has seen the element of chance largely eliminated. Agricultural invention, improved machinery, and better breeding of plants and animals have not only greatly increased the product, but have brought conditions of production to a point where they much more closely approximate those existing in the mill, mine, and factory.

The disappearance of free land has shown itself most strikingly in the tremendous increase in the cost of this fundamental instrument of production in agriculture.

In the 200 years in which the continent was conquered, prairie sod turned, forests cleared, millions of farm homes and other buildings erected, and during which, in fact, more labor was applied to land than at any previous time in the history of the world, the total value of all land reached only a little over thirteen billion dollars. In the last 10 years, when less new land was brought under cultivation than at any period in the last half-century, the value added to the land was over fifteen billion dollars.

This great increase in farm values has been most marked in a few special sections and is only a part of a movement that shows how agriculture is concentrating in certain localities.

In the states touched by a circle with a 500-mile radius and Chicago as its center, there is already located 57.7 per cent of the value of all farm property, 60.7 per cent of the value of all farm land, 51.3 per cent of the value of all live stock, and 68 per cent of the value of all cereals is produced. It was just in this territory that the value

of this land increased most rapidly, over 60 per cent of the total increase in the last 10 years, being in the states touched by such a circle.

Even more important is the fact that in this territory the number of farms decreased by over 30,000 in the last 10 years. Here where industry is most profitable; here where land is increasing most rapidly in value; here where the product is greatest; here the children of the farmers are being driven from the farms and the number of opportunities for new openings in agriculture are growing constantly less. *In the five states of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, and Iowa, which form the heart of this territory, the most important agricultural section of the United States, the population in rural localities absolutely declined, and this decline in farms was in those operated by owners.* There are 10,000 less farms operated by owners in Iowa than there were in 1900; 8,000 less in Indiana, and 13,000 less in Illinois.

In 1880, 69 per cent of the farms of Illinois were operated by owners and 31 per cent by tenants; in 1910, 41 per cent were operated by tenants and but 59 per cent of the farmers owned the land upon which they worked.

In the counties in which the value of land and product is greatest, this percentage runs much higher.

This increase in tenantry in proportion to the value of the product and to the perfection of agriculture is even more strikingly seen in the only other section of the country that can rival this one in importance.

In the cotton section, wherever we find a high production of cotton we find a high ratio of tenantry. In Texas, 55 per cent of the farms are now operated by tenants; in Mississippi and Georgia, 66 per cent; South Carolina, 63 per cent; in Louisiana and Oklahoma, 55 per cent, and everywhere this percentage is swiftly increasing.

When the countries in which the production of cotton is greatest are studied, this percentage rises to a far higher point. In the six leading cotton counties of Georgia, the percentage of the land tilled by tenants varies from 73 per cent to 85 per cent; in the six leading cotton counties of South Carolina, between 66 and 80 per cent of the farms are rented. Mississippi furnishes a most striking example of this kind of evolution. Its alluvial bottoms are the greatest cotton-producing country in the world. There are eight counties here where the average value of the land in farms is more than \$25 per acre. In this section, which represents the very apex of cotton cultivation, 89 per cent of the farms were operated by tenants in 1900 and 92 per cent in 1910.

But in both the North and the South a new force is coming in to hasten every one of the tendencies that have been noted. In every industry, so long as the principal operation had to be performed by either man or animal power, any high development of concentrated ownership and of capitalist exploitation was impossible. In farming the great task has been the turning of the soil, and hitherto this has been done by animal power. *Now the farm tractor has come, driven by kerosene or gasoline or steam, to do this work, and is bringing the same revolution there that the application of the explosive engine has brought in transportation.* Although these tractors are of very recent introduction, yet they are already accomplishing a revolution. Their great expense places them far beyond the reach of the renter or even the small farm owner, even if the latter were able to use them economically on his small acres. These machines will be operated by mechanics—not by farmers, when necessary; and for mechanics the entire labor supply, trained in mines and mills and factories, will be available.

In cotton production a similar mechanical revolution is taking place. Here the great task is that of picking, and already mechanical cotton pickers are being introduced that do the work of from 16 to 20 men.

In market-gardening a similar transformation is taking place. Here glass-covered farms with heat and water and light, controlled artificially, are so expensive as to be as completely beyond the reach of those who work in them as the great factories in which thousands of wage-workers toil.

To sum up, the disappearance of free land and the swift rise in farm values is placing the land out of the reach of the small farmer. The race of tenants is increasing. The farm tractor, the cotton-picker, the mechanical milker, the great inventions now in use in the production of vegetables near cities, all these are tending to create a condition in which the worker on the farm will be as completely separated from the instrument with which he works as is the worker in the factory.

It is not the Socialist or the working-class who are taking the small farm from its owner; it is the great forces of capitalism which are fostered, maintained, and supported in every way by the political parties of the capitalist class. *The Socialist Party does not come forward to assist in this process of reducing the farmer to the condition of tenant and wage-worker. The Socialist Party comes, on the contrary, to point to a way out; to point to the possibility of release for the farmer now being driven from his land.*

Since this article was prepared for the 1912 campaign book the United States Department of Agriculture has published a bulletin (No. 41, Bureau of Plant Industry) which confirms in a most remarkable manner the conclusions drawn above.

The investigators of the department selected three typical areas, one each in Indiana, Illinois, and Iowa. In these typical districts, says the report, "of the 700 farms studied, 57 per cent were operated by owners and 43 per cent by tenants."

The average capital invested per farm was \$17,535 in Indiana, \$51,091 in Illinois, and \$23,193 in Iowa. The general average for all the farms in the three districts was \$30,606, a far greater sum than the average investment in manufacturing or trading.

On these farms the owners who worked their own farms made a little less than factory wages. The report says: "Deducting 5 per cent interest on the average capital leaves an average labor income of \$408 for the 273 farm owners. . . . The assertion that farmers are making large profits is erroneous. They are living on the earnings of their investment and not on the real profits of the farm. . . . One farmer out of every 22 received a labor income of over \$2,000 a year. *One farmer out of every 3 paid for the privilege of working his farm, that is, after deducting 5 per cent interest on his investment he failed to make a plus labor income.*"

It will be noticed that of the entire number 9 men with less than \$5,000 capital received \$74 for their year's work. Only 2 farmers out of 46 with less than \$10,000 invested made over \$400. *Out of the entire 273 only 12 men received over \$2,000 labor income. Each of these had more than \$20,000 invested. The chance of a farm owner making a labor income of \$1,000 with less than \$15,000 invested is less than 1 in 20.* This, it must be remembered, is in the most favorable agricultural region in the United States.

But the tenant without capital is equally helpless. To

quote: "Almost without exception the tenant's income is in direct proportion to the sum he has invested."

These are all the phenomena that have preceded and forced concentration in ownership in other lines of industry. That this concentration is taking place is noted: "According to the last census the farms in the North Central States are growing fewer in number and larger in area. . . . Of all the farms operated by owners there were 20 of just 40 acres in area, the average labor income of which was \$70. None made a labor income of \$1,000. There were 26 men on 80-acre farms and only one of them made a labor income of \$1,000. Of the 25 men on 160-acre farms, 1 in 5 made \$1,000 or more." In other words, *the farm of less than 160 acres is below the point of profitable operation*. The table giving area and income shows a continuous and unbroken increase of labor income as the acreage of the farm increases, and the reporters comment on this as follows: "Thus the decrease in the number of farms in the North Central States is no cause for alarm. It is rather a sign that land is being utilized more efficiently and that the same products are being produced at less cost."

This is a complete confirmation of the Socialist theory of concentration, but scarcely carries comfort to the small farm owner who is being forced into the ranks of tenants and hired laborers.

What Socialism will do for the Farmer

The Socialist Party proposes to do all in its power to alleviate the condition of the farmer who now works with his own hands on his little bit of land; but it is not blind to the fact that all the Socialists or anyone else could do would not protect him in that ownership against the power-

ful forces that are taking his farm from him. So the party comes forward with the proposal that producers of wealth on the farm shall join with those of the factory to obtain the ownership of the things necessary to their lives.

Just as the Socialist Party proposes to restore the ownership of the factory and mill, the mines and the railroads to those who work in them and who create wealth through their use, so it proposes to restore the lands and the machinery to the men who produce the crops of this country; but this cannot be individual ownership in either case; so *the Socialist Party believes the time has now come for the beginning of socially operated farms; these farms would be sufficiently large to use the most improved machinery; they would be officered and directed by the socially trained graduates of our agricultural educational institutions and their wealth would all go to those who produced it and worked upon the farm.*

Pending the time when such farms can be established, the following program adopted at our National Convention pledges the party to the enactment of a series of measures especially designed to afford relief to the great class of workers on the farm.

Proposed Farmers' Program

1. The Socialist Party demands that the means of transportation and storage and the plants used in the manufacture of farm products and farm machinery shall be socially owned and democratically managed.

2. To prevent the holding of land out of use and to eliminate tenantry, we demand that all farm land not cultivated by owners shall be taxed at its full rental value, and that actual use and occupancy shall be the only title to land.

3. We demand the retention by the national, state, or local governing bodies of all land owned by them, and the continuous acquirement of other land by reclamation, purchase, condemna-

tion, taxation, or otherwise; such land to be organized as rapidly as possible into socially operated farms for the conduct of collective agricultural enterprises.

4. Such farms should constitute educational and experimental centers for crop culture, the use of fertilizers and farm machinery, and distributing points for improved seeds and better breeds of animals.

5. The formation of co-operative associations for agricultural purposes should be encouraged.

6. Insurance against diseases of animals and plants, insect pests, and natural calamities should be provided by national, state, or local governments.

7. We call attention to the fact that the elimination of farm tenantry and the development of socially owned and operated agriculture will open new opportunities to the agricultural wage-worker and free him from the tyranny of the private employer.

2. AGRARIAN RESOLUTION OF 1912

In addition to the above program, the Convention of 1912 made the following demands:

1. The erection by the state at convenient points of elevators and warehouses for the storage of grain, potatoes, and other farm products; and connected with these provisions for municipal markets wherever the people of the community desire. We call attention to the fact that constitutional amendments providing for these measures were killed by the old parties in the last legislature.

2. Establishment by the state of one or more plants for the manufacture of farm machinery and binder twine.

3. State or county loans or mortgages and warehouse receipts, the interest charges to cover the cost only.

4. State insurance against destruction of animals and crops.

3. THE AGRARIAN PROGRAM IN OKLAHOMA

The Socialist Party of the State of Oklahoma adopted the following program in 1912:

Article 27. Renters' and Farmers' Program.—The Socialist Party stands for every measure that will add to the material, intellectual, and moral welfare of the working-class, and as the working-class of Oklahoma is largely made up of agricultural workers, we submit the following as the Renters' and Farmers' Program of the Socialist Party of Oklahoma:

Section 1. The retention and constant enlargement of the public domain—

By retaining school and other public lands;

By purchase of arid and overflow lands and the state reclamation of all such lands now held by the state or that may be acquired by the state;

By the purchase of all lands sold for the non-payment of taxes;

By the purchase of segregated and unallotted Indian lands;

By the retention of leased lands after the expiration of leases and the payment of the improvements thereon at an appraised valuation.

Section 2. Separation of the department of agriculture from the political government by means of—

Election of all members and officers of the board of agriculture by the direct vote of the actual farmers—subject to the right of recall;

Introduction of the merit system among the employees.

Section 3. Erection by the state of grain elevators and warehouses for the storage of farm products; these elevators and warehouses to be managed by the board of agriculture.

Section 4. Organization by the board of agriculture for free agricultural education and the establishment of model farms.

Section 5. Encouragement by the board of agriculture of co-operative societies of farmers—

For the purchasing of land;

For the buying of seed and fertilizer;

For the purchase and common use of implements and machinery;

For the preparing and sale of produce.

Section 6. Organization by the state providing for loans on mortgages and warehouse certificates, the interest charges to cover cost only.

Section 7. State insurance against diseases of animals, diseases of plants, insect pests, hail, flood, storm, and fire.

Section 8. Exemption from taxation of dwellings, tools, farm

animals, implements, and improvements to the amount of one thousand dollars.

Section 9. A graduated tax on the value of rented land and land held for speculation.

Section 10. Absentee landlords to assess their own lands, the state reserving the right to purchase such lands at their assessed value, plus 10 per cent.

Section 11. Land now in possession of the state or hereafter acquired through purchase, reclamation of tax sales, to be rented to landless farmers under the supervision of the board of agriculture at the prevailing rate of share rent or its equivalent. The payment of such rent to cease as soon as the total amount of rent paid is equal to the value of the land, the tenant thereby acquiring for himself and his children the right of occupancy. The title to all such lands remaining with the Commonwealth.

See also " Roumania "; and note absence of agrarian measures in German program under " Germany."

CHAPTER VIII

THE LAND

It is obvious that the agricultural problem is very largely the same as the land problem. But this fact has not as a rule been fully recognized by the Socialists—outside of Great Britain. This is due to the natural fact that the land problem, aside from its purely agricultural aspects, is more important in that country than elsewhere. Land rent, especially urban land rent, absorbs a very considerable proportion of the total income of Great Britain, doubtless a larger proportion than in any other of the great nations.

The only country, therefore, in which the problem of the nationalization of the land or of land rent has been in the forefront of Socialist discussion is Great Britain. There have been innumerable scientific discussions of the question among the Socialists of Germany and other countries, but it is only in Great Britain where it has assumed the first political importance—and it is therefore only in Great Britain that the Socialist parties have taken a definite attitude towards the problem—although we may assume that the Socialists of other countries will proceed largely along parallel lines.

I. THE BRITISH LABOR PARTY CONFERENCE OF 1914

(From Official Report of the Conference)

Mr. W. C. Anderson [I. L. P.] moved the following:

That this Conference, whilst expressing its satisfaction at the

increasing interest now being taken in the land question by reformers and politicians, warns the working-class against favoring any proposals which would strengthen the position of the great territorial owners, or perpetuate the private ownership of the land, whether by the creation of a class of peasant proprietors or otherwise, and declares that only such proposals for temporary and immediate reform as tend towards bringing the land and its values into the ownership of the community are worthy of support. Further, as a practical means of nationalizing the land the Conference recommends the Parliamentary Party to prepare and introduce a bill enacting that a levy shall be assessed on all landed estates, urban and rural, for the setting up of a land redemption fund to enable the nation to reacquire its lost rights of ownership in the land within a reasonable period, and on terms which shall fairly recognize all existing interests.

He said the whole problem was coming before the country in a prominent way. The resolution suggested that the land should be the property of the people; that there should be a tax on both urban and rural land, and by that means a redemption fund could be set up which would enable the country within a reasonable time to secure control and possession of the land with a reasonable regard for existing interests.

The resolution was formally seconded and agreed to.

II. THE CONFERENCE OF THE BRITISH INDEPENDENT LABOR PARTY, 1914

The Congress passed a vigorous resolution in favor of the nationalization of land, as follows:

That this Conference, whilst expressing its satisfaction at the increasing interest now being taken in the land question by reformers and politicians, warns the working-class against favoring any proposals which would strengthen the position of the great territorial owners, or perpetuate the private ownership of the land, whether by the creation of a class of peasant proprietors or otherwise, and declares that only such proposals for temporary

and immediate reform as tend towards bringing the land and its values into the ownership of the community are worthy of support. Further, as a practical means of nationalizing the land, the Conference recommends the Parliamentary Party to prepare and introduce a bill enacting that a levy shall be assessed on all landed estates, urban and rural, for the setting up of a land redemption fund to enable the nation to reacquire its lost rights of ownership in the land within a reasonable period, on terms which shall fairly recognize all existing interests.

That this Conference, believing the land question cannot be solved by denunciation of landowners and vague reference to the taxation of land values, calls upon the N. A. C. to organize a land nationalization campaign and to formulate a scheme for the socialization of the land—to urge upon the Labor Party in Parliament and on municipal and other public bodies the necessity for the adoption of such a scheme, and for a public inquiry, by royal commission or otherwise, to demand public production of titles to land in order to bring to public knowledge the basis on which the present system of land tenure is possible.

III. THE CONFERENCE OF THE BRITISH SOCIALIST PARTY, 1914

(Resolution adopted by 1914 Conference, including discussion)

The British Socialist Party at this Conference advocated, by an overwhelming majority, the solution of the land question through a system of free transportation, the socialization of land, co-operative production, the destruction of the slums, and the placing of their inhabitants into the country.

The resolution submitted by H. M. Hyndman, on behalf of the executive committee, read as follows:

This Conference of the British Socialist Party being convinced that the land proposals of the Liberal Government are useless, harmful, and reactionary; that taxation of so-called land values, however justifiable from the point of view of readjustment of middle-class burdens, solves no problem of production or distribution for the mass of the people; that leasehold enfranchisement is similarly futile; that the refusal of both political factions

to face the reorganization of agriculture and rural production generally, as well as land ownership in country and in town, is a grave danger to the nation; and that no scheme of land reform can be even moderately beneficial which fails to deal in the first instance with the question of transport on a national scale, resolves: (1) That a national system of free transport by rail and motor road should be set on foot forthwith; (2) that the right of the nation to resume possession of its own land should at once be declared and acted upon; (3) that co-operative production on the land and in factories under the control of the community and local councils be commenced at an early date, beginning with the organization of unemployed labor; the goods so produced being communally distributed among the producers and not thrown upon the competitive market for commodities; (4) that the destruction of the slums in our great cities be commenced immediately, the families and children so displaced being provided with healthy homes in the country and taught agriculture in addition to their ordinary trades.

“Mr. Hyndman said that it was very important to discuss the land question now on account of the proposals before the country, not one of which would benefit the working-class in any way. He thought it very desirable that the Conference should pass a resolution in favor of something which would really benefit the worker, although he might not get it at once. Agriculture was the most important and valuable of all industries, and its decay in Great Britain was injurious to the whole people. Even to-day it was the largest and most important single industry. The dependence of the country for five-sixths of its food upon foreign sources of supply was a permanent national danger. Under present conditions cost of transport dominated agricultural production, and the railways of Great Britain constituted by their harmful policy a great system of protection in favor of the foreigner. Canada, the United States, India, the Argentine, and Australia were all within the 35-mile radius of London as reckoned by freight. He had put that

fact before a royal commission twenty-two years ago, but from that time to this no proper attention had ever been paid to it. The differential rates in favor of foreign produce carried by British railways still further intensified the effect of cheap water carriage against home cultivation. The important matter of free transport by national railways or specially built motor roads could only be settled by the nation through its delegates elected under proportional representation. Free transport was one of the most important questions of the moment, and it was impossible to hope the agricultural question could be settled until free transport was obtained. The people who said that free transport could not be obtained under present conditions forgot there were a good many things free—sewage and education were examples.

“The ownership or leasing of land by small holders imposed of necessity excessive and unremunerated toil upon the cultivators, and an endless gray monotony of existence. Small holdings were advocated by the Liberal Party, and peasant proprietorship by the Tory Party; both proposals were injurious and reactionary. The antagonism between town and country would be increased by the creation of a class of small cultivators or small proprietors, for their interest would be to obtain a high price against the city workers, and the increase of private property would foster reaction. Agricultural land of itself was of small value; manure, machinery, glass houses, and other appliances for tillage were more valuable than the land itself, and cultivators who did not possess these to a sufficient extent were at a hopeless disadvantage. The taxation of land in town and country would be mere burden-shifting in the interests of the capitalists, and no wage-earner would thereby have his wages increased a farthing. Elevators for storage should be established nationally and communally. Healthy,

comfortable homes for the whole people could not be provided under capitalist conditions. The entire land system must be considered from the point of view of bringing about co-operation of production and distribution between country and town. Collective organization and ownership under capitalism, the competitive wage-earning system remaining unchanged, could be nothing better than state slavery for the workers.

“L. E. Quelch [Reading], in seconding the resolution, said it was especially the business of Socialists to get at grips with the land proposals of the Liberal Party. He knew the conditions of life in the villages, and said that at the present time—largely owing to the fact that in the towns and cities they were losing their influence through the work of the Socialists and the labor movement generally—the Liberals were advocating these, to them, drastic reforms in the endeavor to get back their political influence in the agricultural districts. Now was the time for the B. S. P. to bring its counter proposals in opposition to those of the Liberal Party.

“Without further discussion the resolution was then carried by an overwhelming majority.”

CHAPTER IX

THE TRUSTS

THE Socialists' position on the trust question is derived from their attitude towards the evolution of industry generally. Marx predicted the coming of a monopolistic period in industry and welcomed it. In all countries the Socialists have approved the tendency of all industry to be organized on a larger and larger scale, as they look forward to the day when all the more important industries of each nation shall be operated as single units by governments under the control of the people.

I. THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF PARIS, 1900

With regard to trusts, the International Congress of Paris (1900) declared that "these coalitions of the exploiters of industry and commerce are inevitable, constituting a high form of production," but, on the other hand, that they have a tendency in the long run "to raise prices everywhere and always in the interest of the combined capitalists as well as to check the lowering of prices which would [otherwise] result from the improvement of production." They tend, furthermore, the Congress declared, to "increase the oppression of the workers by opposing their unions." The Congress did not recommend, however, opposition to trust formations, regarding the organization of trusts as a logical result of the system of production, which should be tolerated, under suitable conditions and restrictions, until the working-class becomes strong

enough, through political and industrial organization, to effect their expropriation.

II. THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF AMSTERDAM, 1904

In 1904 the International Congress of Amsterdam passed the following resolution unanimously :

The trusts have their complete development, even in competition, in the world of production.

They grow gradually into gigantic associations, organized nationally, or even internationally, and reduce many industries to a complete monopoly.

The trusts are an inevitable consequence of competition, and they represent a system of production based on low wages.

In these conditions the associations of capitalists of all countries and of all industries form powers composed on the basis of their common interest. Also the conflict between the capitalist class and the working-class becomes more and more accentuated. Production is regulated, diminishing waste, and assuring the efficiency of labor, but all the benefit is for the capitalists, while the exploitation of the workers is intensified.

Considering these facts, and in view of the experiences which show the futility of legislation against trusts,

The Congress of Amsterdam, affirming the conclusions of the Congress of Paris, declares :

1. That the Socialist Party of all countries should abstain from any attempt whatever to prevent the formation of trusts, or to restrain their development.

2. The efforts of the Socialist Party should be in the direction of the socialization of production, having for its object the general well-being and the elimination of profits.

The method of establishing the socialization, and the order in which it will be effected will be determined by our power of action and by the nature of the industries trustified.

In opposition to these organizations, which menace the economic organization of the workers by the consolidation of the capitalist forces, the workers of the whole world must oppose a force organized nationally and internationally, as the single arm against capitalist oppression and the only means of bringing to an end the régime of capitalist society by establishing Socialism.

CHAPTER X

GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP

THE Socialists unanimously favor government ownership in every case where they feel that the government is controlled by the people; where the government is not so controlled, they are usually opposed to government ownership. A large number of governments are difficult to classify, and in such instances the Socialist position is decided according to circumstances—especially in regard to the policy to be adopted by the government after the proposed nationalization has taken place. And in no case is government ownership, no matter on how large a scale, regarded as Socialism, unless the Socialists are in control of the government, so as to be able to direct the policies of the governmental industries along Socialist lines.

There can be no question that the German Party has given more attention to this problem than has any other Socialist group. The principles laid down in the Reichstag in 1913 are therefore of first importance.

Under the more democratic government of Great Britain, the policy to be followed in nationalized industries has naturally received less attention. There the whole effort has been made to *secure* nationalization, without making any conditions—under the assumption that the government is already sufficiently democratic to insure at least considerable benefits to the people.

The government of the United States is probably to be regarded as being, on the whole, at least as democratic as that of Great Britain. But the greater centralization of

capital in this country, in the hands of the trusts, has led American Socialists to a somewhat more critical attitude towards government ownership. It is for that reason that the proposed nationalization of the banking system has not yet been fully acted on by the American Party.

I. THE SOCIALIST GROUP IN THE GERMAN REICHSTAG, 1913

(From speech of Hoch in the Reichstag, 1913)

We would be in favor of a government monopoly *if the income derived therefrom were used to cut down the taxes on foodstuffs and necessary articles of consumption, or for social purposes.* I have, in the following sentences, outlined my idea of a state monopoly: (Our italics.)

(1) The nation shall secure possession of the existing industries by confiscation (*Enteignung*), wherever it is impossible to purchase them at their actual cost price.

(2) The management of the potash works, as well as the sale of its products, shall be conducted by the nation under the direct supervision of an advisory commission. This commission shall consist of members elected by the Bundesrat, the Reichstag, and representatives of the employees and managing officials of the potash works, elected by secret and equal ballot.

(3) The employees and staff of the potash works shall have entire freedom to organize. All laws concerning workingmen's protection and compensation shall be applicable to workers employed in the state monopoly, especially those laws introduced in the Trade and Commercial Law. The workday shall not increase over eight hours, and in places where the work is dangerous to the health of the worker it shall be reduced to less than eight hours.

In every plant the employees, together with the management, shall elect by an equal, secret, and direct ballot an employees' commission (*Arbeiterausschuss*), which shall determine the wages, salaries, and general conditions of work for the plant. This commission shall likewise settle all differences and shall have the right to appeal to the general commission against the decisions or orders of the management concerning working conditions.

(4) Wages and salaries shall be determined by the management

and the workingmen's commission upon the basis of a minimum wage. The minimum wage must receive the indorsement of the Reichstag.

(5) The selling price of the product shall be fixed separately for home and for export sale, by law, after due consideration of the home agricultural industry.

(6) The profits of the potash works shall be used to reduce taxes on foodstuffs and necessary articles of consumption or for social purposes.

If the state ownership of the potash works is carried out according to these fundamental principles, I am convinced that we shall have accomplished something in the interests of the laboring class. (Great applause from the Social Democrats.)

II. THE BRITISH LABOR PARTY CONFERENCE OF 1913

(From official Report of Conference)

“Mr. Herbert Smith [Miners] moved:

“That it be an instruction to the Labor members in the House of Commons to seize every opportunity to press forward in that House the bill to nationalize the coal mines and minerals of the United Kingdom, and provide for the national distribution and sale of coal.

“He said that he thought the matter had been talked about long enough. The bill had already been prepared and was under the consideration of the Labor Party.”

“The resolution was put and agreed to.

“Mr. J. N. Mercer [York Labor Party] formally moved the following:

“That this Conference declares that in the interests of the workers, the railways, land, canals, and waterways, now monopolized by a few persons, should become the property of the nation, with a view of them being utilized and worked for the benefit of the people; and that the executive committee be instructed to take such parliamentary action that may be necessary to secure this end.

“The resolution was formally seconded and agreed to.”

III. THE REPORT ON CURRENCY TO THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES, 1914

In 1913 the National Committee elected a sub-committee to investigate the banking, bank credit, currency, and monetary systems of the United States. This committee, consisting of Karl Sandberg, Arthur Le Sueuer, and Lucien Sanial, the latter of whom did not participate in the report, made their report in May, 1914. After a detailed analysis of the monetary system, they arrived at the conclusion that this system had been created by laws passed by Congress which "have put into the hands of a few individuals, who probably do not number one in one hundred thousand," a power that gradually "has come to control the entire nation"; that this power has been the means by which the present capitalist system has been perfected; that without the destruction of this economic power the overthrow of the capitalist system is impossible.

A bill was proposed in the report, as follows:

Title.—To provide for a national banking and money system, for its maintenance and operation; for the creation of a national board of banking and money, defining the powers and duties of said board; prohibiting the loaning of money and the extension of credit for hire by private persons, or by any firm, co-partnerships, corporation, or by combinations of persons, firms, co-partnerships, or combinations of kind whatsoever.

Scope and Purpose.—Section 1. The general scope and purpose of this act is *to establish a governmental monopoly of the loaning of money and the extension of credit for hire*, and to provide a way to commercialize the credit of all classes of business and commerce, and to prevent the overcapitalization of private business, industries, and commercial enterprises of all kinds.

The party has not yet acted on the recommendations of this committee.

CHAPTER XI

IMPORT DUTIES

THE Socialists of Europe are either in favor of immediate free trade or of a rapid lowering of the tariffs. The Australian Labor Party, however, takes the opposite position. (See Australia.) The American Socialist Party also leans towards free trade or low tariffs; but ex-Congressman Berger and other leaders are opposed to any sudden tariff changes. The American position, on the whole, has been that the tariff question is a secondary issue which concerns capital more than it does labor.

The Socialists of Germany strongly favor free trade, to be brought about gradually by trade treaties with all other countries. However, there has been a very small minority in Germany defending the protective policy, and there are signs that in that country and elsewhere this minority may be considerably strengthened by the present war.

The present position of the European Socialists is illustrated by the resolution of the Italian Party Congress of 1914; that of the American Party by the discussion at the Congress of 1912.

I. THE ITALIAN CONGRESS RESOLUTION AGAINST PROTECTIONISM, 1914

The Fourteenth National Congress of the Italian Socialist Party (1914) considering that the protective tariff is a means by which certain capitalistic groups exercise a most odious exploitation at

the expense of the great mass of consumers; that it is one of the strongest factors in the high cost of living and diminishes proportionally the effective value of money, in fact of the rendering useless the advantage of the increase in wages obtained by the workers by virtue of their organization;

Considering that, if it maintains some industries in artificial life, it prevents others from starting and developing, which use as raw material the products of the protected industries and would have a luxuriant development and successfully attack the international market if they could first get their raw material cheaper; and while it is beyond question a hurt to the workers in so far as they are consumers, brings them no advantages (on the contrary, it does harm to many) even as sellers of labor;

Considering finally that the artificial life given to certain industries renders competition still fiercer between nations, and more frequent the danger of conflicts between them, and impels them to seek by colonial enterprises markets for their products on terms of monopoly; and thereby offers an incentive to the continual increase of armaments and to squanderings that constitute a new burden for the workers;

Decides, on the eve of the renewal of the treaties of commerce to use all the power of the party to ventilate the secret practices of the groups of protected capitalists and to obtain the abolition, even if only gradually, of the protective tariff, and gives a mandate to the executive committee of the party to organize such an agitation and—since the question also interests many other nations—to solicit for this purpose the intervention of the International Socialist Bureau.

II. THE AMERICAN CONVENTION OF 1912

The discussion regarding paragraph 3 of the political demands of the party platform shows the Socialist attitude in 1912 as to the tariff. (See Part I.) As will be noticed, free trade is definitely favored, but there is disinclination to make an issue of the tariff, on the ground that it has little importance for the working-class as such. It will be noticed that the tariff plank was finally struck out.

Section 3 of the political demands was read as follows:

3. *The gradual reduction of all tariff duties, particularly those on the necessities of life. The Government to guarantee the re-employment of wage-earners who may be disemployed by reason of changes in tariff schedules.*

At the Party Convention of 1912, Delegate Barnes of Pennsylvania opposed the clause which guaranteed employment of those displaced, on the ground that reduction in the tariff would not throw anyone out of a job for more than a week. It would simply reduce the profits of American firms. He declares that one could buy a Douglas shoe, an American sewing machine, or a McCormick reaper cheaper abroad than at home. Delegate Berger then spoke as follows:

Delegate Berger [Wisconsin]: I have always held that the tariff issue is not a workingman's issue.

Delegate Barnes: That is what I think.

Delegate Berger: I have always told them that there is always free trade in labor. While our manufacturers are protected by 300 per cent in some instances, there is always free trade in labor. However, we are facing a condition and not a theory. We have to take a stand. *In all the countries that I know of where we have a Socialist Party, the Socialist Party as such takes the stand for free trade more or less.* That is the International view. However, if we do it in this country we face the following situation: Entire cities, entire communities have been built up by the high tariff. If there should be a sudden reduction many thousands would be thrown out of employment, and we meet this situation by this paragraph. I am not saying that the Socialist Party should make free trade or high tariff an issue. We have a thousand better issues. We are simply explaining our stand on this question, and it seems to me that this clause is all right.

Delegate Hillquit: How are they to be re-employed?

Delegate Berger: The Government to give them employment.

The Government can do it. This does not mean that we should go out and preach free trade or that we should take a stand for high tariff. It simply explains our position on the tariff. But for my part I shall never make an issue of the tariff. I do hope that you will accept this as read.

The motion to strike out clause 3 was adopted by a vote of 117 ayes and 94 nos. (Our italics.)

CHAPTER XII

TAXATION

THE present Socialist movement is about 50 years old. During the first half of this period comparatively little attention was given to problems of taxation. It was considered that all taxes were *expended* almost exclusively for capitalistic purposes, and were *paid* also by capitalists, as the wages of the working-people were kept at the same low level in any case. If taxes raised the cost of living, it was only necessary for the capitalist slightly to increase wages; if the indirect taxation of the workingman consumer was small, then less wages were paid.

But there has been a growing tendency, as we have pointed out in dealing with the high cost of living, to regard the workingman as a consumer as well as a producer, and at the same time the Socialist parties have begun to appeal to other elements of the masses besides manual wage-earners. However, the Socialists of the continent of Europe did not make a problem of practical politics out of the taxation question because of their position on the voting of budgets. Until the beginning of the present war, with the single exception of Germany, all the parties of continental Europe refused to vote in favor of the governmental budget as a whole, on the ground that many of the purposes for which the governmental money was expended were anti-Socialistic, for example (and chiefly), the army and navy. Besides voting against governmental expenditures, the Socialists thus voted—at the same time—against all forms of taxation.

The one exception was Germany, and this exception occurred only in 1913. Undoubtedly the voting of additional taxation for military purposes by the Socialists in that year was caused by preparations for the present war then taking place in Germany and other countries. Even on this occasion, the Socialists did not vote for the budget as a whole, and it is still denied by a large portion of the party that Socialist principles allow such a vote. Nevertheless, the majority now undoubtedly feels that governmental budgets may be supported in the future. And there can be no doubt that the Socialists of certain other countries are prepared to follow the Germans' example, largely on the ground of the financial support given by the Socialists of all countries to their governments since the beginning of the present war.

The discussion and action of the German Party Congress of 1913 was then the first practical decision reached by Socialists on the taxation question. Moreover, the conclusions reached as to general taxation policy (aside from the budget question) were in accord with the previous Socialist position in Germany and in the other countries.

The discussion of the military and of the taxation questions at the Congress of the German Party in 1913 was really one discussion. The military problem is handled in the volume, *Socialists and the War*. In order to make clear, however, the position of the Congress as to taxation, it is necessary to show the relation of this question to the military problem. For this purpose we quote the article by Herman Wendel, Socialist member of the Reichstag, in *The New Review* (September, 1913).

I. THE TAXATION QUESTION

By Herman Wendel (Member of the Reichstag)

“If the fight of the Social Democratic Party against the strengthening of the army was a battle in which from the very beginning it was impossible to hope for victory, it was otherwise with the struggle over the bill providing the necessary funds. The ruling class, nobility and bourgeoisie, has hitherto, by means of indirect taxation, saddled upon the propertyless masses the cost of its expensive naval and military policy. Indirect taxation was Bismarck’s ideal (“because the individual does not suspect that he is paying taxes”), and by indirect taxes and assessments all the expenses of the military, naval, and colonial policies have been met in the glorious era of Wilhelm II. Thereby all the food articles and the absolute necessities of the great mass have been gradually raised in price to the extreme limits of the endurable. The burden of the German people through indirect taxation amounts to-day to 25 marks (six dollars) per person. That is to say, a working-class family of four persons (father, mother, two children), having an income of 1,000 marks, pays out 100 marks, or 10 per cent of its income, in indirect taxes! The last great plundering of the people through indirect taxes was accomplished in 1907. As is well known, the Social Democratic representation in the Reichstag [had] decreased in the elections of 1907 from 81 to 43. The reactionary parties thought to make use of this opportunity, and they put through a ‘financial reform’ with new taxes amounting to 500,000,000 marks (about \$125,000,000), which were obtained almost exclusively by indirect taxes upon brandy, beer, tobacco, matches, etc. The Social Democratic Party has always opposed vigorously all attempts at new indirect taxation and has several times sought, though without suc-

cess against the bourgeois majority, to carry through its taxation program providing for direct and progressive income, property and inheritance taxes throughout the Empire. Thus far the direct taxes have been reserved for the federal states, where they are under the jurisdiction of reactionary Parliaments—witness Prussia!—and hence can be assessed according to the will and desire of the possessing classes. The bourgeois parties, chiefly the representatives of the great landowners and of mobile capital, have feared, as the devil fears holy water, to hand over by an imperial income and property tax ‘the pocketbook of the possessors’ to the Reichstag, elected by universal and equal suffrage.

“If the great landowners and the owners of mobile capital had had their way, the immense cost of the monstrous military increase would now also have been saddled by means of indirect taxes upon the propertyless masses of the people. But . . . the wind had changed. The people, embittered by the taxation robbery of 1907, had cast four and a quarter million of Socialist votes in the Reichstag elections of 1912, and in the Parliament were seated 110 Socialists who could not be utterly ignored. . . .

“Nothing would have pleased the reactionary parties better than if the Social Democratic Party—dogmatically applying the principle: ‘Not a man nor a penny for this system’—had stood passively aside and left entirely to the majority of the Reichstag the framing of the finance bill. The Conservatives and Clericals even sought to impose upon the Government the condition that the military bill and the finance bill should be passed by one and the same majority. That would have meant the entire elimination of the Social Democratic Party, for under no circumstances could it have voted for the increase of the army. But after the army increase was no longer to be avoided,

it could well take part in the framing of the finance law in a manner according with its principles and also with the contents of the joint manifesto issued March 1, 1913, by Social Democratic representatives in the German Reichstag and by the Socialist representatives in the French Chamber of Deputies, namely: That the delegations on both sides of the Rhine were determined, in case the resistance against the military bills in the two countries should be unsuccessful, to see to it that the new burdens should fall upon the rich.

“Therefore a motion was [made] by the Social Democratic representation during the discussion of the military tax in plenary session. It read:

The tax upon incomes shall amount, with an income of from 5,000 marks to 10,000 marks, to 1 per cent of the income; of the next partial or complete

10,000 marks.....	3	per	cent	of	the	income
50,000 “	6	“	“	“	“	“
100,000 “	9	“	“	“	“	“
500,000 “	12	“	“	“	“	“
1,000,000 “	15	“	“	“	“	“

“This motion was naturally lost, but in the form in which the military assessment was finally passed it reached deeply enough into the money bags of the rich. The tax upon property begins at a property of 10,000 marks only when there is at the same time an income of at least 5,000 marks, otherwise not until 50,000 marks, and it rises from 0.15 per cent to 1.5 per cent for properties of more than 5,000,000 marks. For incomes the tax begins with 1 per cent for 5,000 marks, and rises to 8 per cent for incomes of 500,000 marks. Even comparatively small incomes of between 5,000 and 10,000 marks, which were drawn upon

for the defense fund, had an educational purpose, for these are the incomes of all those elements of society, such as school principals, judges, and retired officers in the army and navy societies, who are the loudest shouters for military increases, who had never before been called upon to open their pocketbooks. But the main portion of the military assessment falls upon properties of between 100,000 and 1,000,000 marks. The 255 taxpayers in Prussia, each of whom is assessed upon more than 10,000,000 marks, must together pay 81,000,000 marks. The richest armament manufacturer in Germany, the husband of Bertha Krupp, will have to pay a round 6,000,000 for his share alone. That will surely have a cooling effect upon the overflowing military enthusiasm of these circles of society.

“The Conservatives offered violent resistance to these property taxes, but the votes of the Social Democratic Party were necessary in order to pass the law. It would have been remiss in its duty to the working-class had it allowed this opportunity to pass without imposing upon the rich a portion of the burdens entailed by a policy pursued solely in the interests of the rich.

“But the Social Democratic representatives, after mature reflection, also voted in favor of the military assessment, although it would have passed even had they voted against it. This affirmative vote arose from the circumstance that the military assessment represents the first step toward a taxing system corresponding in principle to the demands of the Social Democracy. . . .

“As before, we hold to the principles ‘Not a man and not a penny for this system!’ But in this case, after the man had been granted by the capitalist majority, it was solely a case of having the penny paid by the capitalist

class alone. That is in nowise contradictory of Socialist principles. . . .

“If the question is put whether the capitalist class shall enjoy its surplus value untaxed and the working-class be bled by means of indirect taxes, or whether the capitalist class shall pay heavy taxes from their stolen surplus value and the working-class be protected from an increase in the price of necessities, there can, for a Socialist, be no doubt as to the answer.”

II. REPORT BY WURM TO THE GERMAN PARTY CONGRESS OF 1913

The discussion of general principles of taxation in the Congress was led by Wurm, who submitted the following report and resolution, which were adopted:

It is not a mere accident that we have had, up to this time, no deeper inquiry into the tax question. For our past needs Lasalle's *Arbeiterprogram* [1867] has been sufficient. For hitherto there has been no opposition of interests between the representatives of mobile, i.e., trade or industrial capital, and fixed, or immobile capital, i.e., land, upon the question of taxation. Mobile and immobile capital were united in their desire to throw the burden of taxation upon the laboring class, by taxing the necessities of life. In the state legislatures (*Landtagen*) the struggle between movable and fixed capital is [now] increasing in bitterness from day to day. The growing capitalist class is vehemently opposing the burdens which the landowning group is trying to heap upon it. The parties which represent the small capitalist and the middle class,—the Progressives, a part of the National Liberals, and a part of the Center,—were forced to vote in favor of direct taxes on capital in the state legislatures.

The class that is in power forces its weaker opponents to bear the burden of public expenditures, whether the landowning class oppressed the capitalist class, or whether the two together

oppress the worker. It must of necessity follow that when the working-class becomes a strong political factor, the hour will come when it will hold the balance of power in the struggle between mobile and immobile capital. . . .

Taxation is a vital part of the exploitation of an oppressed working-class by its political and industrial oppressors.

. . . The amount used by the capitalist class for its subsistence is the consumption fund, while that part of the surplus value over and above this amount goes into the production fund of capitalist society. . . .

National undertakings and modern corporations prove the uselessness of the capitalist as an individual even in present-day capitalist industry. The fund necessary for the development of production, on the other hand, must be kept up even in a Socialist state, because production, invention, and distribution must be developed to the utmost possible efficiency in order to make human labor so profitable that each individual may be assured of an opportunity to develop his personality and capabilities to their fullest extent. Even to-day the capitalist is by no means the absolute master of the profits which his factory produces. If he should use the whole profit for his personal consumption his competitors would soon put him out of business. If, therefore, the whole surplus value were to be confiscated by taxation, the working-class, too, would suffer.

A new form of taxation is the formation of state monopolies, in which the state determines the price, in other words, levies a sort of hidden tax. Fortunately we succeeded in preventing a state monopoly of petroleum. (Applause.) . . .

In my resolution we read as follows: . . . "Every direct tax [law], even if levied on the surplus value [profits, etc.] exclusively, shall be opposed, if its purpose is not in harmony with the interests of the working-class, except in cases where this opposition to the direct taxes . . . would not hinder the adoption of the law in question, and [at the same time] would mean . . . taxes even more unfavorable to the working-class [i.e., indirect taxes]." In other words, opposition is to be the rule; the exception, a vote in favor under specified conditions. When, therefore, the military [appropriation] bill has been accepted, we must vote in favor of that [military] tax bill which will not force the worker to bear the tax burden. . . . "Not one cent in

taxes to the capitalist state," you say. The bourgeoisie is daily more [and more] imperialistic. Every new military bill is sure to be accepted. What shall we do when the military bill has become a law! . . . Shall we say: "Now, good Father State, and good Ruling Parties, please, we should like to pay, besides!" . . . The military bill has passed. The only question remaining [is]: "Shall we prevent the piling up of new burdens upon the shoulders of the laboring class, or shall we not?" . . .

III. TAX RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE GERMAN CONGRESS OF 1913

The Congress demands, in accordance with Article X of the Party Program:

Graduated income and property taxes to cover all public expenditures, in so far as these can be covered by taxation. . . . Inheritance taxes, graduated according to the size and value of the estates and the degrees of relationship. The repeal of all indirect taxes, tariffs, and other measures that sacrifice the interests of the people at large to those of a small minority.

The Congress demands further:

.

The expenses of the states (*Bundesstaaten*) shall be covered by additions to the direct national taxes.

To cover municipal expenditures we demand, in accordance with the decision of our Congress of Bremen: State endowments for public health, public education, public charity, and the building of roadways.

Additions to the state income, property, and inheritance taxes. Wherever such state taxes do not exist, municipalities shall have the right to levy special income, property, and inheritance taxes.

Taxation of the unearned increment of land.

The Congress further declares:

In voting on national, state, or municipal tax measures, not only the character of the tax, but its purpose as well, shall determine the vote of the Socialist representatives.

In accordance with the resolution of Nürnberg, 1908, our representatives shall oppose all budgets presented by a capitalist government, at its final reading, provided the opposition of our comrades does not signify the adoption of a budget even more dangerous to the interests of the working-class. In the same manner, every direct tax, even if levied only on the surplus value, shall be opposed, if its purpose is not in harmony with the interests of the working-class, except in cases where this opposition of the direct taxes by our comrades would not hinder the adoption of the law in question, and would mean, at the same time, taxes even more unfavorable to the working-class.

In accordance with our program, our comrades in the legislative bodies have always striven to repeal existing indirect taxes, the burden of which is borne by the working-class, in favor of direct taxes, without considering the purpose for which these taxes have been levied. In the same way they must strive to prevent the levying of new, indirect taxes upon the working-class. If this can be done only by voting in favor of direct taxes, they shall so proceed, because in that case the purpose of the direct taxes will be to prevent adoption of indirect taxes.

The Congress supports the declaration of the parliamentary group given in connection with the vote on the military appropriation bill, and expressly approves of the vote of the Socialist representatives in favor of both property taxes.

(See also "The United States.")

CHAPTER XIII

IMMIGRATION AND THE RACE QUESTION

THAT any genuinely international movement would be opposed to the restriction of immigration may be taken for granted, especially if the restriction were along racial lines. The decision of the International Congress at Stuttgart was, accordingly, unanimous, although it will be seen that it was not satisfactory to all the American delegates.

But wherever a racial difference furnishes a good pretext, as in the United States and the British colonies, the labor unions are overwhelmingly in favor of restricting the competition of labor along racial lines by anti-immigration laws. As most Socialist parties follow the labor unions, it cannot be a matter of surprise that the Australian Labor Party has taken the same position and that the American Socialist Party is much divided on the question.

Even when the alien race is already in the country, the labor unions often continue to support the policy of discrimination. This is seen especially in South Africa.

I. THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST CONGRESS OF 1907

After a long and animated debate, the Stuttgart Congress adopted a resolution submitted to it by the commission on emigration and immigration. It declared that immigration and emigration were phenomena inseparable from the substance of capitalism, and that the restriction of freedom of migration and the exclusion of foreign nations and races were fruitless methods of solving the

problem. It recognized that it was the duty of organized workingmen, however, to protect themselves against the lowering of their standard of living which frequently resulted from the mass importation of unorganized workingmen, and recommended the following measures:

I.—For the countries of immigration.

1. Prohibition of the export and import of such workingmen as have entered into a contract which deprives them of the liberty to dispose of their labor power and wages.

2. Legislation shortening the workday, fixing a minimum wage, regulating the sweating system and house industry, and providing for strict supervision of sanitary and dwelling conditions.

3. Abolition of all restrictions which exclude definite nationalities or races from the right of sojourn in the country and from the political and economic rights of natives, or make the acquisition of these rights more difficult for them. It also demands the greatest latitude in the laws of naturalization.

4. For the trade-unions of all countries the following principles shall have universal application in connection with it:

a. Unrestricted admission of immigrant workingmen to the trade-unions of all countries.

b. Facilitating the admission of members by means of fixing reasonable admission fees.

c. Free transfer from the organizations of one country to those of the other upon discharge of the membership obligations towards the former organization.

d. The making of international trade-union agreements for the purpose of regulating these questions in a definite and proper manner, and rendering possible the realization of these principles on an international scope.

5. Support of the trade-unions of those countries from which the immigration is chiefly recruited.

II.—For the countries of emigration.

1. Active propaganda for trade-unionism.

2. Enlightenment of the workingmen and the public at large on the true conditions of labor in the countries of immigration.

3. Concerted action on the part of the trade-unions of all countries in all matters of labor immigration and emigration.

In view of the fact that emigration of workingmen is often

artificially stimulated by railway and steamship companies, land speculators, and other swindling concerns through false and lying promises to workingmen, the Congress demands:

Control of the steamship agencies and emigration bureaus, and legal and administrative measures against them in order to prevent the abuse of emigration in the interest of such capitalist concerns.

III.—Regulation of the system of transportation, especially on ships. Employment of inspectors with discretionary power who would be selected by the organized workingmen of the countries of emigration and immigration. Protection for the newly arrived immigrants in order that they may not become the victims of capitalist exploiters.

In view of the fact that the transport of emigrants can be regulated only on an international basis, the Congress directs the International Socialist Bureau to prepare suggestions for the regulation of this question, which shall deal with the conditions, arrangements, and supplies of the ships, the air space to be allowed for each passenger as a minimum, and shall lay special stress that the individual emigrants contract for their passage directly with the transportation companies and without intervention of middlemen. These suggestions shall be communicated to the various Socialist parties for the purpose of legislative application and adaptation, as well as for purposes of propaganda.

II. THE AMERICAN CONGRESS OF 1910. ASIATIC IMMIGRATION

No discussion of the Socialist position would be complete without showing the attitude of the International and of the American Socialist to that world-question which is the only one which at present seems at all likely to bring America into war.

The International Socialist Congress at Stuttgart in 1907, which was the first to take this matter up, declared in a most definite way against exclusion along racial lines, as being in conflict with the principles of proletarian solidarity.

The American Party Congress at Chicago, held three years later (1910), showed that this party was unwilling to accept the Stuttgart resolution. The American Party Congress of 1912 showed a similar situation.

In view of the somewhat strained relations existing between the United States and Japan, which many think may be the prelude to war, the timeliness and importance of this discussion is self-evident.

The majority of the committee (of which Untermann was chairman) appointed to report on this matter to the American Socialist Congress of 1910, argued as follows:

Sometimes the party, in acting for the immediate interests of the working-class, must come into apparent conflict with its ultimate ideals. This is unavoidable; *we work toward our ultimate ideals through and despite these immediate contradictions*. The Socialist Party, in its present activities, cannot outrun the general development of the working-class, but must keep step with it. . . .

We therefore indorse every demand made and position taken by the International Congress on this question, *except those passages which refer to specific restrictions or to the exclusion of definite races or nations*. We do not believe that such measures are necessarily "fruitless and reactionary," as stated by the International Congress, but on the contrary are convinced that any measures which do not conform to *the immediate interests* of the working-class of the United States are fruitless and reactionary.

We advocate the unconditional exclusion of Chinese, Japanese, Koreans, and Hindoos, not as races *per se*, not as peoples with definite physiological characteristics,—but for the evident reason that these peoples occupy definite portions of the earth which are so far behind the general modern development of industry, psychologically as well as economically, that they constitute a drawback, an obstacle and menace to the progress of the most aggressive, militant, and intelligent elements of our working-class population.

We recognize, with Marx, that the progress of working-class emancipation does not proceed uniformly and by identical methods in all countries, but that the working-class of each nation

will have first to settle with its own ruling class *before* absolute international working-class solidarity can be realized. (Our italics.)

Against this it was argued by the other side that as long as the working-people are divided among hostile nations, often engaged in making war against another, they will never be able to accumulate the force needed to overthrow the ruling class in any nation.

The committee report favoring exclusion was brought before the Convention by Untermann. He said:

As far as Asia is concerned, Asia has immense opportunities for developing an outlet. They need not come over here. Japan has Manchuria and Korea. China has vast districts which it can conquer. Let the Chinese capitalists develop Chinese society, just as the American capitalists have developed American society. Let them find room for their unemployed over there and employ them there and develop their own society. Let the Socialists of those countries organize their co-operative commonwealth themselves first, and then, when they have that organization, when they have their strong Socialist and labor organizations, *then let them talk to us about international solidarity.* (Our italics.)

Untermann declared that the backward environment in China has developed in the Chinaman certain qualities that make him less easily assimilable than even the lowest European immigrant.

Victor Berger, also a member of the committee, dwelt upon the fundamental differences between the whites and the other races. He said:

We are all of the same type; of the same sort of thinking; we may fight occasionally, but after all our mode of thinking is very much the same. But, comrades, it is entirely different with these other races. They have their own history of about *fifty thousand years*. That cannot be undone in a generation or in two generations, or in three generations.

The committee's resolution was defeated and a substitute

proposed by Morris Hillquit was adopted. At the Indianapolis Convention (1912) the committee on immigration again reported and was again continued until the next convention.

III. THE AMERICAN CONGRESS OF 1912

The majority of the committee at Indianapolis (Untermann, Stitt, Wilson, Hunter, and Wanhope) reiterated their former position. The majority report was, in part, as follows:

In the course of the discussion [in 1910] Morris Hillquit introduced a substitute for both reports. *This substitute evaded the question for or against the existing exclusion laws*, merely demanding that the mass importation of contract laborers from all countries should be combated by the Socialist Party.

After a debate lasting nearly two days, the Congress adopted Hillquit's substitute by a vote of 55 against 50.

This close vote induced the Congress to recommit the question for further study to a new committee on immigration, with instructions to report to the National Convention of 1912.

In this new committee the same alignment immediately took place. After a fruitless effort of the chairman to get unanimous action, the majority decided to act by itself and let the minority do the same. . . .

Race feeling is not so much a result of social as of biological evolution. It does not change essentially with changes of economic systems. It is deeper than any class feeling and will outlast the capitalist system. It persists even after race prejudice has been outgrown. It exists, not because the capitalists nurse it for economic reasons, but the capitalists rather have an opportunity to nurse it for economic reasons because it exists as a product of biology. It is bound to play a rôle in the economics of the future society. *If it should not assert itself in open warfare under a Socialist form of society, it will nevertheless lead to a rivalry of races for expansion over the globe as a result of the play of natural and sexual selection. We must temper this race feeling by education, but we can never hope to extinguish it altogether. Class-consciousness must be learned,*

but race-consciousness is inborn and cannot be wholly unlearned. A few individuals may indulge in the luxury of ignoring race and posing as utterly raceless humanitarians, but whole races never.

Continued study and the developments on the Pacific coast during the last two years convinced the majority of this committee more than ever that *the existing exclusion laws against Asiatic laborers should be enforced, and be amended in such way that they can be more effectively enforced.* The details of the necessary amendments should be worked out by our representatives, or by our future representatives in Congress, and submitted for ratification to the committee on immigration, which should be made permanent for this purpose.

It does not matter whether Asiatic immigration is voluntary or stimulated by capitalists. There is no room for doubt that the capitalists welcome this immigration, and that its effect upon the economic and political class organizations of the American workers is destructive.

Where races struggle for the means of life, racial animosities cannot be avoided. Where working-people struggle for jobs, self-preservation enforces its decrees. Economic and political considerations lead to racial fights and to legislation restricting the invasion of the white man's domain by other races.

The Socialist Party cannot avoid this issue. The exclusion of definite races, not on account of race, but for economic and political reasons, has been forced upon the old party statesmen in spite of the bitter opposition of the great capitalists.

Every addition of incompatible race elements to the present societies of nations or races strengthens the hands of the great capitalists against the rising host of class-conscious workers. But the race feeling is so strong that even the majority of old party statesmen have not dared to ignore it.

From the point of view of the class-conscious workers it is irrational in the extreme to permit the capitalists to protect their profits by high tariffs, against the competition of foreign capital, and at the same time connive at their attempts to extend free trade in the one commodity which the laborer should protect more than any other, his labor power.

It is still more irrational to excuse this self-destructive policy by the slogan of international working-class solidarity, for this

sentimental solidarity works wholly into the hands of the capitalist class and injures the revolutionary movement of the most advanced workers of this nation, out of ill-considered worship of an Asiatic working-class which is as yet steeped in the ideas of a primitive state of undeveloped capitalism. . . .

The international solidarity of the working-class can be most effectively demonstrated, not by mass immigration into each others' countries, but by the international co-operation of strong labor unions and of the national sections of the International Socialist Party. . . .

The common sense Socialist policy under these circumstances is to build up strong national labor unions and strong national Socialist parties in the different countries and work toward more perfect solidarity by an international co-operation of these labor unions and parties. To this end the Socialist Party of America should consider, above all, the interests of those native and foreign working-class citizens whose economic and political class organizations are destined to be the dominant elements in the social revolution of this country.

In the United States this means necessarily the enforcement of the existing exclusion laws against Asiatic laborers, and the amendment of these laws in such a way that the working-class of America shall fortify its strategic position in the struggle against the capitalist class.

International solidarity between the working-people of Asia, Europe, and America will be the outcome of international evolution, not of sentimental formulas. So long as the minds of the workers of nations and races are separated by long distances of industrial evolution, the desired solidarity cannot be completely realized, and while it is in process of realization, the demands of immediate self-preservation are more imperative than dreams of ideal solidarity. (Our italics.)

The minority of the committee, Laukki, Spargo, and Meyer London, proposed the reaffirmation of the International resolution of the Stuttgart Congress of 1907. By continuing the committee the Congress showed it was satisfied with the committee's personnel, four being for racial exclusion and three against it. Leo Laukki, of the Finnish

Socialist Federation, a minority member of the committee, reported as follows:

Our party must remember, before the policy presented by the majority report can be warranted, that both it and the unions have done practically nothing in regard to the Asiatic laborers in the other way. They have not even tried to organize the Asiatic laborers, any more than they have tried to organize the other foreign workers of the United States, and still they have courage to claim that the Asiatics cannot be organized. At least before our party in this question can refute its basic principles and declare itself in favor of a policy which is mainly sought for only by the blind clamors of disappearing craft workers and small traders of the Pacific coast, it must try the other way; it must try to reach the Asiatics as well as all other nationalities in the United States by its ideas and organization.

Therefore the only recommendation that can be made to this Convention in regard to the Asiatic laborer is:

That the Socialist Party place an organizer among these Asiatic workers who can speak their languages and in every other way try to help the Asiatics to become acquainted with the Socialist ideas and movement and to form a national Asiatic Socialist organization along the same lines that the other nationalities are organized.

That the Socialist Party declare itself in opposition to the discrimination against Asiatic workers, politically or otherwise, and demand for them the same civil and political rights which it demands for other races and nationalities in the United States.

What becomes of the fact that Asiatics as well as other foreign and native workers, especially women and children, are exploited by the American capitalists as so-called cheap labor, to replace the higher paid craft-workers and so throwing them out into the ranks of the industrial proletariat? It cannot be hindered in the least by any reactionary policy of the dying semi-bourgeoisie and craftsmen. But this cheap-paid industrial proletariat can be hindered from selling its labor-power too cheap; it can and it will be induced to raise its standard of wages, to better its working and living conditions by the general policy

of our party, of which the most effective in this regard will be the demand:

For a general eight-hour working day.

For a minimum wage-scale.

It will be self-evident that when the length of the day and the compensation for the work are stipulated by general laws, backed and enforced by the workers themselves, there will be no possibility nor reason for any capitalist to employ cheap labor. The effects of the cheap labor will disappear only in this way.

IV. THE AMERICAN PARTY AND THE NEGRO RESOLUTIONS OF 1901

(From *The American Socialist*)

In answer to numerous inquiries, *The American Socialist* republished the resolutions adopted by the Unity Convention, 1901, on the negro question. The party since that Convention has taken no position on this question. The resolutions follow:

"Whereas, the negroes of the United States, because of their long training in slavery and but recent emancipation therefrom, occupy a peculiar position in the working-class and in society at large;

"Whereas, the capitalist class seeks to preserve this peculiar condition and to foster and increase color prejudice and race hatred between the white worker and the black, so as to make their social and economic interests to appear to be separate and antagonistic, in order that the workers of both races may thereby be more easily and completely exploited;

"Resolved, that we declare to the negro worker the identity of his interests and struggles with the interests and struggles of the workers of all lands without regard to race or color or sectional lines; that the causes that have made him the victim of social and political inequality are the effects of the long exploitation of his labor power; that all social and race prejudices spring from the ancient economic causes which still endure, to the misery of the whole human family; that the only line of division

which exists in fact is that between the producers and the owners of the world—between capitalism and labor. And be it further

“Resolved, that we, the American Socialist Party, invite the negro to membership and fellowship with us in the world movement for economic emancipation by which equal liberty and opportunity shall be secured to every man and fraternity become the order of the world.

Several of the state organizations of the Socialist Party in the south have taken a determined position on the negro question. The Oklahoma organization, for instance, has always fought for the full enfranchisement of the negro as well as the white race. Other state organizations have taken no steps of this character.

V. THE AUSTRALIAN LABOR PARTY AND THE RACE QUESTION CAMPAIGN OF 1914

(From *The Brisbane Worker*)

A White Australia

“The Australian Labor Party, when they held the balance of power, demanded, as the price of their support, a White Australia. A White Australia is now the law of the land. (See Immigration Restriction Act, 1901.)

Abolition of Black Slavery

“The Australian Labor Party, when they held the balance of power, demanded that the system of black slavery then existing in Queensland should be abolished and the Kanakas sent back to their islands in the Pacific. The Kanakas were sent back. (See Pacific Island Laborers Act of 1901-6.)

White Grown Sugar

“The Australian Labor Party insisted that sugar cane could be grown and sugar produced in Australia by white

labor—that the question was one of wages and not of climate. Time has proved this to be positively true. In the sugar season of 1902-3, 67,107 tons of cane sugar were produced by colored labor and 31,688 tons by white labor. In 1912-13, 6,693 tons were produced by colored labor and 122,571 tons by white labor—the proportion of sugar produced by colored labor declining from 68 per cent of the total for 1902-3 to 5 per cent of the total for 1912-13. (See *Commonwealth Year Book*, 1913, page 340.) ”

VI. THE AUSTRALIAN WORKERS' UNION

(From article by “Jarrah” in *The New Review*)

[The recent formation of this union marks the appearance of a new economic force, frequently at variance with the older unions and their political representatives.]

“The A. W. U. seems to see the necessity of one big union. Throughout Australia the farm workers were paid very poor wages, in some instances only \$3.60 per week, with keep. Very often the places the men slept in were worse than unhealthy. They slept in the end of the stable, among the wagons, sometimes in a stripper, or in an unsanitary hut without a floor. On the average, their condition was pitiable. . . . About four years ago they formed the Rural Workers' Union, which accomplished very little. Then about eighteen months ago the powerful A. W. U. came along and persuaded the Rural Workers to amalgamate. . . . Then the scale of wages for rural workers was drawn up and published. It practically doubled the old rates. Bank managers, auctioneers, machinery agents, and others who exploit the farmers urged them not to pay the new scale. But the A. W. U. formed camps for the men, where finally most of the farmers had to go if they wished to engage harvest hands. It is confidently asserted that

the Waterside Workers will join forces with the A. W. U., and if so the United Laborers' Union will not be long in following it.

"It will thus be seen that the A. W. U. has solved the problem of 'the organization of the unskilled.' In Australia any manual worker can join the A. W. U. Carters, laborers, carriers, sheep-drovers, wharfmen, sailors, and in fact anyone can be a member. Very often men join it in preference to joining the union for their own calling."

This organization does not admit all unskilled workers, however. Its constitution provides that "no Chinese, Japanese, Kanakas, or Afghans, or colored aliens other than Maories, American negroes, and issue of mixed parentage born in Australia shall be admitted to membership."

VII. THE LABOR PARTY IN SOUTH AFRICA, 1913

From a statement signed by the leaders of the South African Labor Party and trade-unions and published all over the world in the *News Letter* of the International Trade-Union Federation:

Some years ago the natives and other colored inhabitants sent a deputation to London requesting, among other things, that the colored workers be granted the same franchise rights as the white workers; the South African Labor Party, however, advised its English colleagues to oppose the granting of the franchise to the colored workers.

The trade-unions are also opposing, tooth and nail, the encroachment of the colored workers upon skilled trades. Most unions stipulate that only white men may become members, and demand that all skilled trades be closed to colored labor, at the same time boycotting those firms employing colored men as skilled workers, even though they be paid the same wage as the white artisans.

In spite of this, however, it seems that the colored workers have in recent years forced their way more and more into all trades and have begun to strive for the same wages and conditions as the white men. They possess a political party and certain journals, which are doing their utmost to place them on a level with the white men, in education as in every other direction.

This happy development is less attributable to any efforts on the part of the white men than to the ruthlessness of the employers and the authorities. In certain industries, force of circumstances have brought the workers of the various races closer together, especially in Cape Colony, while in the north, where the competition is more perceptible, the antipathy of the white man to the colored man is still insuperable.

Up to the time of the fourth annual conference of the Labor Party, held recently, the propaganda on behalf of the Labor Party was conducted among the white men only, but the delegates from Cape Colony, where the colored men have also the vote, demanded that the latter be admitted to the party, since their support could be depended upon in the case of elections. . . .

It should here be remarked that all progeny arising out of intercourse between the white men and the colored inhabitants are regarded as "colored." . . . The Kaffir question is in itself a great question; there are hundreds of thousands of Kaffirs in South Africa working under the most atrocious conditions, who are treated as neither colored nor white men, but as a race apart from all others.

What is to be done about the Kaffir question, aside from keeping them down and preventing them from becoming skilled workers, the statement does not say.

CHAPTER XIV

MILITARISM

THE Socialists' opposition to war and the chief causes of war, such as militarism and imperialism, has been treated in a companion volume, written at the suggestion of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society (*The Socialists and the War*). However, militarism is not only an international but also a domestic problem; it absorbs a large part of governmental expenditures and it introduces anti-democratic features in government. We accordingly illustrate the Socialist attitude to the domestic aspect of militarism in the following chapter.

All the countries of Europe have given a large part of their attention to agitation against militarism, Germany as much, if not more, than any other. But in Germany, Austria, and Russia the party has been unable to adopt any definite program of domestic agitation or to enter into free discussion because of the restriction of liberty of speech of this subject. The German Party press, for example, has contained as much criticism of militarism as the party papers of other countries, but the German Party has not been able to adopt a program of radical resistance. Besides the press agitation, the chief Socialist action in that country has been the attack on the governmental military measures which takes place in every session of the Reichstag. (See *The Socialists and the War*.)

The French Socialists were able to go further; they openly advocated an international strike and insurrection,

as the resolution of the Congress of 1912 shows. We therefore reproduce documents showing their position.

I. THE FRENCH SOCIALISTS

1. RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE CONGRESS OF 1912, AT THE TIME OF THE MOROCCO WAR SCARE

The National Congress of the Socialist Party notes with pleasure the demonstrations the French proletariat, in response to the appeal of the International against the war.

It sees in these demonstrations the prelude to an effort at organization which alone will enable the labor class of our country to fulfill its entire duty.

Never has the need to combat all the menaces of conflict been more imperative. Never will a more monstrous, a more anti-national, and a more anti-human war break over Europe.

Should the great European nations be drawn into it, it would not be because of anxiety for their independence, nor for vital reasons, but because of the most foolish aberration and most artificial combinations.

Neither the workers nor the Democrats of France will permit our country to be thrown into the most horrible conflict because of secret treaties of which the democracy knows not a single clause.

To save civilization from the most cruel disaster, the human race from the most terrible affliction, reason from the most dire humiliation, the French proletariat will fight to the end against any attempt at war.

To prevent it they will use all legal means. In Parliament they will call for the secret treaties, they will insist on unlimited arbitration; they will denounce the exclusive and narrow views of diplomacy. In the country they will increase their meetings, their mass demonstrations, in order to awaken citizens from their torpor and to protect them from lies.

And if, in spite of their efforts, impudent minorities let the conflict loose, if France is dragged into war by combinations of secret diplomacy, the workers and the Socialists of France will have the right to discuss quite openly, fully conscious of their responsibility, a recourse to revolutionary measures, *the*

general strike and insurrection, so as to prevent or hinder the conflict and wrest the power from the ruling classes who will have unchained the war.

The Congress is convinced that the best guarantee for peace is that all rulers should know that they cannot without peril for themselves provoke the disasters of a general conflict.

It hopes that a *common effort* of propaganda and action on the part of the proletariat of every country may prevent the bursting out of the general war by which the world is threatened periodically.

It requests the delegates at the Congress of Basle to work in accord with the International, and by unanimous resolution to intensify everywhere the propaganda and action against war.

II. JAURÈS ON MILITARISM IN THE CHAMBER OF DEPUTIES, 1913

[Jaurès spoke on the Socialist motion to adjourn the discussion of the loan (November 27, 1913).]

Jaurès opened by saying that the proposed military loan would have varying results according as it was being used merely to liquidate a ruinous past or to permit the continuance of the aggravation of mistakes which had placed France in the most serious financial position since 1871. He continued:

This position is due, above all, to the three-years' law [the statute of 1913 raising the term of service from two to three years], and the financial burden which it imposes is aggravated by a terrible economic burden. The lessening of the use of the product of our national labor and an increasing importation of the product of foreign [labor] is the direct consequence of this economic burden.

The three-years' law would also have the effect of impoverishing the crops of industrial workers by diminishing the number of pupils in the higher schools and fostering foreign competition against us.

Jaurès then came to the loan itself:

And now what are the fiscal burdens which the proposed scheme adds to the economic burden of the law? They are of two kinds: first, the burden of a loan. I estimate this only at 900 millions, because in the plan of the minister of finance there are only 900 millions intended to meet extraordinary expenses; the rest is intended to hide for the time a part of the deficit.

To the burden of this loan there is to be added the regular annual burden of a deficit amounting to at least 800 millions.

New expenditures must be expected for public works, for the public schools which can only be protected by being improved, and for increase in the pay of the officers. The deficit is therefore in reality more than a billion.

Without doubt France has superb resources, but the question is whether its growth is more rapid or slower than that of other countries. It is certain that it is slower. The three-years' law is going to arrest this development still further. Up to the present it has been a great misfortune to have postponed the long-promised fiscal reform; to-day, whether you exact this billion from the impoverished masses or whether you are going to ask for it in fiscal reform, either way the Government is going to make a mess of it.

It is true we pledged ourselves to a progressive tax on income and capital, taxes which would demand sacrifices from the rich. But why did we make this pledge? To relieve the burdens on the poor, to lower licenses, to lighten the land tax which crushes the small farmer, to reduce the tax on food which oppresses the daily life of the people, to endow more generously the great avenues of justice and of social solidarity, to establish insurance against all the workers' risks, to build sanitary homes in place of the wretched lodgings to which the workers are condemned.

That is why we demanded these heavy taxes on wealth and capital, and to-morrow, when you vote this new tax, if you do not find a means of keeping down illegitimate expenditures, they will still further increase the burden which already weighs down the working-class.

This crisis is so grave that the Government is trying to hide it from itself. There lies the reason why M. Barthou said a few days ago: "Who then would dare take the responsibility of proposing to this country 800 millions of new *taxes*?" . . .

M. de Mun and his friends say that if the budget shows a

deficit, the cause should not be sought in our national expenditures, but in our foolish demagogic prodigality.

What are the figures of the social expenditures? . . . The cost of the application of all the laws of pensions or relief does not exceed 200 millions in a budget of 5 billions. Including immediate expenditures, it can be said that the military expenditures reach 2 billion 300 million, an increase of more than a billion since 1909. . . .

The present time is favorable to opening the paths of the future and to making way for the reduction of armaments by international arbitration. The Balkan crisis has left everywhere only reaction and disillusionment. The fatigue created by the flood of war and militarism is general. . . .

All nations have in their mouths the bitter taste of their recent experiences. Not a single government but has come out of it weakened, and even the Balkan people have not been able to carry to a finish their war of independence; from a war of conquest it became a war of extermination.

We have seen new antagonisms springing up in the Mediterranean. It seems that Bulgaria is escaping to Russia. Germany, reconstructing her military mission at Constantinople, has heaved upon her eastern frontier the rumbling of the Slavic world. Austria has separated Servia from the Adriatic but has drawn upon herself the resentment of a part of the Balkan people. Italy is in the shoals of Tripoli, which is of no use to her except as a vantage-point from which to attack others, and, meanwhile, her politics oblige her to save her royal government by the secret help of the votes of the Vatican.

England, sulking against the Young Turks, at first abandoned them, but she felt arising the anger of millions of Musselmen in Egypt and India. When the governments question themselves, when they ask what have been the happy consequences of all these intrigues, of all these vanities so dazzling and so soon extinguished, they will see that will all emerge from these events weakened. One thing alone has been strengthened: the war budget and the general misery from this universal deception. (Applause extreme left.)

Yes, the hour has come. The great and profound forces of peace have been working under this disorder; the nations had a desire for peace so strong that it has served as ballast to the disabled governments. It remains for a government rising in

the name of the tradition of the French revolution to make of this desire one of the forces in the history of to-day, in the history of to-morrow.

Jaurès went on to say that in the sustained effort to keep peace during the crisis, three races had been in agreement: Germany, England, France, and he recalled the saying of Mirabeau: "*The day when Prussia, England, and France agree to live in peace, on that day will be consummated the most beneficent revolution that mankind has accomplished.*" He continued:

This phrase was said on the eve of a vast social upheaval: take warning; the masses are suffering and are becoming exasperated under the overwhelming burden which is crushing them; the English proletarians are on the eve of general strikes so vast that they will result in profound disorder; in France the world of the workers is a prey to a secret strain; everywhere the workers weighed down by the tithe of capital, by the tithe of a monstrous militarism, are stirring; if you do not take the road pointed out by our motion, beware lest you see sinister disorders arise.

III. THE ITALIAN CONGRESS OF APRIL, 1914

The following resolution on armaments was passed by the Italian Congress of 1914:

The Congress affirms that the antagonism between Socialism and militarism is a corollary to the antagonism that exists between the proletariat and capitalistic bourgeoisie;

That militarism, apart from being a system of coercion of the proletariat and of defense of the capitalistic régime, answers the views of capitalism, which in this period of social evolution either seeks new colonies to exploit, or seeks to invest in easy and lucrative loans to the state, according to the well-known parallelism between the increase in military expenses and the increase of public debts;

That the proletariat, especially in the countries that have least capital, like Italy, has a vital interest in opposing militarism,

both for itself and for the capitalistic expenditures that it causes, whether they find expression in the form of taxes that increase the cost of living, or whether they are expressed in the form of diminishing the capital applied to productive investments, industry, and commerce, and so cause economic crises, lack of employment for laborers, and emigration; and

While it proposes in domestic affairs to intensify the propaganda and the education of the masses, and especially of the young, in respect to the foregoing principles, steadfastly opposing the common interests of the internationalism of labor to the system of national provocation of the patriotic bourgeoisie;

And while it again commits to the parliamentary Socialist group the duty of continuing the most strenuous opposition to military credits, and endeavors to aid them by the active and direct action of the organized proletariat;

Decides to submit to the International Congress at Vienna a special request for the reorganization of the International Socialist Bureau for the purpose of giving that bureau the specific functions of:

a. Undertaking a special propaganda among the great international labor-union federations to win them all to the international idea,—peace and anti-militarism,—and to drill them for all practical measures that may render wars impossible; and

b. Giving effect to a speedy system of mutual information through the international press, whether bourgeois or Socialist, for the sake of setting forth clearly the simultaneous and contemporaneous character of the international proletarian, anti-militarist movement in the various countries, in order to eliminate every apprehension lest the movement should weaken any one state in favor of any other, and to give the world a vivid idea of the active, imposing, decisive union of the organized proletariat against war and against militarism.

IV. THE AMERICAN PARTY CONGRESS OF 1912. MILITARY EDUCATION OF CHILDREN

We reproduce below, as indications of the American Socialist attitude, the party resolutions against military education of children.

Whereas, The capitalist class is making determined and persistent efforts to use the public schools for the military training of children and for the inculcation of the military spirit; therefore, be it

Resolved, That *we are opposed to all efforts to introduce military training into the public schools*, and that we recommend the introduction into our public school system of a thorough and progressive course in physical culture, and

Resolved, That we request the national executive committee to suggest plans and programs along this line and furnish these to the party membership, together with such advice in the matter as may be helpful to the party membership in introducing such a system into our public schools.

On motion the resolution was adopted as read.

V. CONSCRIPTION AND THE AUSTRALIAN LABOR PARTY

1. FROM ARTICLE BY J. W. BARRY IN "THE DAILY CITIZEN" (LONDON), JANUARY 27, 1914

"All other important measures have been submitted to a referendum, but by the consent of both political parties, the Defense Act was passed into law without consulting the people. . . .

"When compulsory training was first established very little protest in an organized form was offered. Hardly a member of Parliament criticised it, and practically all the opposition came from Quakers and the Socialists.

"What is the position to-day? Eighteen months ago three Adelaide men formed the Freedom League. To-day it has a membership of 45,000! At almost every sitting of the House the act and its administration are criticised.

"Take the prosecutions as the final test of popularity. In less than two years over 18,000 lads have been prosecuted and over 1,000 have been imprisoned in jails and barracks rather than submit to military tyranny.

"Labor now knows that in the Defense Act there is a

clause which gives the power to the authorities to call out the citizen forces to shoot down strikers, and practically every union in the country is up in arms against it.

“Above all, labor is realizing that this act is not a Citizen Army Act at all. In fact, labor men are coming to see that militarism and citizenship are incompatible, and that as soon as a citizen becomes a soldier under this conscript system he loses his civil rights when they clash with militarism. At the 1908 Labor Conference the delegates decided in favor of a Citizen Defense Force freed from militarism and conscription. What many in the labor movement see to-day is that they have not got what they demanded, and instead they have been used as the tools of the National Service League in its propaganda of an Empire conscription.”

2. FROM ARTICLE BY WILLIAM E. BOHN, IN “THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW,” 1913

“The famous ‘Defense Act’ was first devised by the Liberals, then amended and passed by the Laborites. Its administration has been entirely in the hands of the labor ministers, so the Labor Party has a right to whatever glory there may be found in it. All boys between the ages of 14 and 21 are required to report for military training. During part of their time of service they are gathered into camps for regular drill; during the remainder they are expected to give to the noble art of war the time which would normally be devoted to recreation. In order to make this system possible, the government of the Commonwealth voted \$60,000,000 to be expended within three years. Of course an elaborate staff of officers is necessary, and drill halls, barracks, camp-grounds, etc., must be maintained throughout the Commonwealth.

“The leaders of the Labor Party point to this system as the ideal sort to be maintained by a nation under the control of the working-class. English and French Socialists are constantly advocating a proletarian army for defense against attack by a foreign power. Such an army the Australian Government leaders claim to have established. Mr. Fisher, head of the Labor Government, referred to it recently as a ‘wonderful system for the defense of this country.’

“And yet workingmen and women of Australia do not seem to take kindly to this ‘wonderful system’ inaugurated by their own government. Immediately after the ‘Defense Act’ went into effect the papers were filled with tales of boys who refused to report for service and of parents who refused to allow their sons to do so. Groups of mothers went to the magistrates and made public protests. Labor unions and Socialist locals passed resolutions calling upon members of the working-class to refuse to submit. And, most powerful appeal of all, the boys themselves sent out addresses calling upon others of their own age not to submit. Some of these were evidently inspired by Socialist parents, but there were others which represented the spontaneous rebellion of boyhood against the slavery of military service.

“Any military organization which asks the support of the workers must be democratically organized and absolutely committed to the policy of fighting only against a foreign aggressor. Under no circumstances must its use be permitted in case of internal difficulties. Such use would make it immediately the agent of a class.

“It is true that the Labor Party majority amended the original act to provide for the mobilization of the army

only for defense; it is also true that the Labor Government recently refused to send troops to aid in putting down the tramway strikers at Brisbane. But the parliamentary discussion which followed this latter incident makes it clear that much is to be feared for the future. The whole matter is clearly set forth editorially in *The International Socialist*.

“Mr. Deakin, leader of the Liberal opposition, declared that troops should be used to suppress insurrection, ‘and if ever there was insurrection in Australia, it was in Brisbane.’ As the editorial writer takes occasion to remark, this declaration shows clearly that whenever the Liberals come into power, which they surely will do sooner or later, the ‘wonderful’ proletarian army will be turned against proletarian strikers.

“And Mr. Fisher’s reply was even more alarming. He said: ‘I go so far as to say that a conflict between the troops and the people of Australia at the present time would mean the end of our first-class defense system. It would absolutely defeat and destroy the wonderful system for the defense of this country which is being successfully inaugurated at this time. I am not saying that circumstances could not arise when it would be necessary to send troops to the assistance of a state government, but I mention what, in my opinion, would have been the effect if we had acceded to the request of the Queensland Government.’ There you have it. The reason troops were not sent was that sending them at this particular time would open the eyes of the people as to the nature of the ‘wonderful system,’ and it is quite possible that circumstances may arise under which ‘it would be necessary to send troops’ against Australians on strike. So the proletarian army is not exclusively for purposes of defense against a foreign aggressor.

“No wonder Australians object to being made soldiers of, even by a Labor Government.”

3. FROM ARTICLE BY M. H., IN “THE NEW STATESMAN”
(LONDON), DECEMBER 13, 1913

“How far does the British public realize the true position of the great experiment in modified conscription which this still young democracy on the fringe of the Empire is now making? The experiment is now nearly four years old, and its real character is only just beginning to be understood by the hundreds of thousands of families whose lives it touches in a most intimate fashion. Only this year has the at first small but now growing opposition to the system of compulsory training obtained much public recognition. Only this year, too, on the other hand, has the magnitude of the beneficent change in the manners and physique of adolescent young Australia in the cities, as the outcome of a compulsory senior cadets system, been realized and seriously estimated by careful observers in many walks of life. Only this year, again, have certain leading ministers definitely ranged themselves alongside the Australian Freedom League, which has been busy placarding this city with protests against existing Defense Acts. . . .

“At the outset one thing must be made very clear. Australia is not going back, in any circumstances, to a system of voluntary service plus a small paid army and a large paid navy. The choice made in 1909, when the Cook Defense Act was passed, initiating the compulsory training in the use of arms of all lads between 14 and 18 and their subsequent drafting into a National Militia for a term of years, was a final choice. There will be modifications and adjustments in directions to be indicated, but no abandonment of the principle of compulsion as applied by Colonel Legge and Lord Kitchener in 1909-10. Another

preliminary issue is the question of responsibility for compulsory training legislation. For good or ill, both parties have that legislation indelibly recorded to their accounts. Liberals passed the chief measures: Laborites administered and expanded them. Liberals like Mr. Deakin, Sir Thos. Ewing, and the present prime minister (Mr. Joseph Cook), pioneered statutory enactments; but it was Laborites like Mr. William M. Hughes, M. P., ex-attorney-general, and Mr. 'Chris' Watson, ex-prime minister and counselor-in-chief to the Federal Labor Party, who pioneered ideas and won over the entire Labor movement to the 'Nation in Arms' conception of Commonwealth defense. Only this week the Labor leader of the opposition in the House of Representatives (Mr. Andrew Fisher, M. P., who was prime minister from April, 1910, to June, 1913), in reply to a question by Mr. Conroy, M. P., reaffirmed, amid great cheering on all sides of the House, his profound belief that in giving compulsory training to her boys in senior cadet corps Australia was doing the right thing in the present state of the world. Had labor hesitated or turned tail when the huge military expenditure commitments faced the Fisher Ministry in 1910-13, the entire system would have collapsed. To-day, although compulsory training costs over £3,600,000 a year, and is steadily mounting upwards, the leaders of Australian trade-unionism are, if anything, firmer in their allegiance to the system than the Liberal parents of compulsory cadets. The essential truth is that the men who count in both parties are so obsessed with the Yellow Peril, and so acutely conscious of the diabolical horrors of a war of extermination, such as a war with Japan would be, for the four and a half millions of Australians, that they dare risk any turn in the tide amongst their own people so long as within the next five or six years they can train, officer, and equip an army of a few

hundred thousand white soldiers. They talk a great deal about serving the Empire and setting an example to the men of the old country—but deep down in their hearts is the conviction that it is the safety not of the Empire, but of Australia's standards of civilization, race purity, wages, industrial idealism, and democratic freedom that concerns them. No Liberal or Labor leader ever argues privately that there is the faintest analogy between British and Australian conditions. 'Britain must do as she pleases. We have had to do this thing in order that we get even a hundred to one chance of holding Australia when the shock comes.' That expresses the typical attitude."

(See also Appendix: "Preparedness.")

CHAPTER XV

PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION

SOCIALISTS favor all measures aimed at increasing popular control over Government, such as direct legislation and proportional representation. Direct legislation, however, is not yet a live issue, except in countries already far advanced towards democracy, such as the United States and British colonies. Proportional representation, on the other hand, is an issue almost everywhere, having been already introduced in Belgium and other countries. For several years before the war it had been a leading question in France, and the election of 1914 resulted in a Government favorable to this system.

The general Socialist position is illustrated by the discussion in the American Party. The discussion in the Conference of the British Labor Party of 1914, however, shows that a great many members of that organization place considerations of immediate political success above the democratic principles involved, and their precise motives for doing so were well brought out at that conference.

I. THE AMERICAN SOCIALIST PARTY CONVENTION OF 1912

In the 1912 Convention of the Socialist Party, the subject of proportional representation was vigorously discussed. While some of the delegates expressed their disapproval of this principle, it remained in the platform. Section 5 of the Political Demands (originally Section 6), containing reference to the subject, reads as follows:

The adoption of the initiative, referendum, and recall, and of proportional representation nationally as well as locally.

The discussion provoked by the section was, in part, as follows:

Delegate Lewis [Oregon]: I object to the proportional representation. It will only open the way for parties of reform, prohibition parties, labor parties, and so forth. Our state legislatures will be full of all kinds of representatives. It is a dangerous proposition. . . .

Delegate Smith [Montana]: It seems to me that instead of advocating proportional representation the Socialist Party ought to be standing for representation by absolute majority. If the Socialist Party makes as its fundamental declaration that this is a struggle between classes, then we ought to have absolute majority. . . . If the Socialist Party makes as its fundamental declaration that this is a struggle between classes, then we ought to have absolute majority representation. We ought to have either capitalist government or working-class government absolutely. . . .

Delegate Solomon [New York]: It is evident that the comrades who spoke in opposition to the recommendation of the committee do not know what they are talking about. They seem to be carried away by a few stock phrases. This proposition will be favorable to some reformers. That is enough. That settles it. *As a matter of fact, the accepted position of the International Socialist movement of the world has always been in favor of proportional representation.* I do not understand how any man who understands the meaning of proportional representation can stand up and oppose it. To begin with, there is but one party who can really benefit by it, and that is the Socialist Party. The comrade from Montana says we should either have a capitalist government or a Socialist government. If that is the case, we may as well stop putting up candidates and sending them into the legislative assemblies. . . . You find in state after state that already the Socialist Party has from five to ten per cent of the total vote cast, but has no representative whatever in the assembly. If we had proportional representation it would be possible for the party to have representation in the assembly in proportion to the vote cast for the party candidates. . . .

Delegate Latimer [Illinois]: It is true that in some communities we might land a man or two in the state legislature. That is what happened in Illinois a few years ago. They had proportional representation where a man could go to the polls and vote for three men or one man. That gave a sort of proportional representation, and they sent a few men to the state legislature, but they are not there to-day. . . . The thing we are interested in as a minority party is building up a strong, constructive organization, not to elect men occasionally to the state legislature. It is our business as a minority party to lay foundation for getting control of the Government, and we are not interested in proportional representation. . . .

Delegate Wilson [California]: This amendment is simply reaffirming the demand of the International Socialist movement of the world. If the Germans at this time had proportional representation they would have a very much larger number of men in the Reichstag. We all know that there are thousands of them that are disfranchised because of this very fact that they have not proportional representation. The same is true in Belgium, and the same is true in some of the communes of France. . . .

The motion to strike out the words "proportional representation" was lost, and paragraph 6, as reported, was adopted.

II. CONFERENCE OF THE BRITISH LABOR PARTY, 1914

(Based on Official Report of the Conference)

Mr. F. Knee [London Trades Council] moved:

That this Conference instructs the executive committee and the party in Parliament to press strongly for the adoption of a system of proportional representation applicable to all parts of the United Kingdom for both municipal and parliamentary elections.

The debate which ensued hinged primarily upon the question as to whether proportional representation would necessitate a more expensive or a less expensive campaign;

would lead to more or less bargaining with the Liberal Party; and would divert attention from more important industrial issues, or lead to the selection of a group of Labor members who would bring these issues more effectively than at present in the fore. All conceded that labor would probably have a greater representation in Parliament as a result of such a measure. The opponents of proportional representation advocated the alternative vote (a method, like the second ballot, requiring only single member districts, but avoiding a second election) as a less radical and wiser proposal.

Mr. Knee said the resolution proposed that there should be a different system of counting votes. Judging by what had taken place, the Liberals, if they got the chance, would probably go in for the alternative vote; that was to say, instead of putting a cross to a candidate's name they would have to put 1 opposite the name of the man they most wanted and 2 opposite the next preference. If the Liberals were kindly disposed to the alternative vote that was a reason why the Labor Party should be chary of it. Democrats naturally desired to secure a House of Commons that would be a reflex of the whole of the community, a House that would faithfully represent and contain every considerable body of public opinion. There were masses of opinion in the country right outside the House of Commons. The Labor Party itself was inadequately represented. They might have the second ballot or the alternative vote, but there was no safeguard against a minority of votes in the country being represented by a majority in the House of Commons.

Mr. W. C. Anderson [I. L. P.] said they would all agree that, whatever was going to be done in the future, the present electoral system was out of date, undemocratic, and unworkable. What form was the change going to

take? The alternative vote was simply an improved method of second ballot. It simply allowed the voter to do in one operation what under the second ballot was done after an interval of a fortnight. . . . He submitted it would be a good thing for the Liberal Party and a disastrous thing for the Labor Party. It would mean that there would be three-cornered fights all round. A young party, a minority party, might be able to poll 2,500 or 3,000 votes in many industrial constituencies without being able to secure representation in Parliament. Under the alternative vote in a number of adjoining constituencies they might poll as many as 30,000 votes without getting any representation at all. To get 30,000 or 40,000 working-class voters voting in one direction and not getting a single representative in Parliament was not democracy, but a caricature of democracy. He remarked that the Labor Party in Queensland and Victoria, where they had the alternative vote, were against it. It was a direct incitement to the privileged parties to join together to down the Labor Party. If they were going to have democratic representation they must have constituencies sufficiently wide to allow a large number even of minority votes to get representation in proportion to their electoral strength. Mr. MacDonald had put the whole case for the alternative vote into four lines. . . . He believed that Mr. MacDonald did not want proportional representation or the alternative vote and would only be forced into either, and he asked Mr. MacDonald to make his position perfectly clear. The reform of proportional representation was championed by the working-class movement right throughout the world. Every Labor and Socialist Party in Europe was a Proportional Representation Party.

The most eloquent voice in France in favor of proportional representation was that of Comrade Jaurès, and

the idea of proportional representation had been carried by an enormous vote in the French Chamber of Deputies. They had the system in Belgium, not in its best form, but still they wanted no going back. Among the many colonial and continental politicians who supported proportional representation were Herr Branting, leader of the Swedish Social Democrats, and Mr. Holman, the Labor premier of New South Wales. Mr. Holman had given the following testimony to the merits of proportional representation: "While I believe in proportional representation, I am not in favor of preferential voting. Preferential voting leads to the combination of old and recognized interests against the spirit of advancement. In a ballot with three candidates, for instance, the candidate with progressive ideas may be in the lead in the first count, but, if the supporters of the other two are true to their conservative principles, as the count goes on they will gradually overhaul the third man until he is hopelessly last. . . .

Mr. Philip Snowden, M. P. [I. L. P.] said he felt that the division on this resolution would have such tremendous consequences that he felt it to be his duty to associate himself with it. Proportional representation might be argued very strongly on general and abstract lines, but at the time at his disposal he wished to confine himself to an attempt to answer one question only. Whatever might be their views either on the existing electoral system, the alternative vote, or proportional representation, they were all anxious to see the representation of labor increased in Parliament. Therefore the answer to that question was the most important matter to which they could give their attention. Mr. Wake, in a speech of very great power, put the case for the alternative vote. He [Mr. Snowden] wanted to test the possibilities of the alternative vote as likely to increase Labor representation in the House of Commons

by the experience of the party in the by-elections of the last few years. Since the last general election they had had 12 or 13 contests in which Labor candidates had been before the constituencies. In every case the Labor candidate had been at the bottom of the poll. Under a system of alternative votes not a single one of those votes would have found expression on the floor of the House of Commons. In every instance the Labor man would have dropped out on the first count because he was third on the poll. It had been argued that the fear of "splitting the progressive vote," the fear of letting in the Tory, had a deterrent influence on the men who had sympathies with the Labor candidates in three-cornered contests. He wished to point out that there was another feeling which would operate under the alternative vote. Men with sympathies for labor had at the same time sympathies with other parties. There were a great many Liberals who thought Labor ought to be represented more strongly in the House of Commons. They would no doubt give their first or second vote to a Labor candidate under the alternative vote; but what about the Tory voter? He had a second vote, and to whom was he going to give that vote? He would not give it to the Labor candidate. If he gave it at all, as he undoubtedly would, he would give it to the Liberal; and therefore the absolute certainty was that on the final counting of the votes, no matter what position the Labor candidate took in the first count, the result would be that he would be in a woeful minority. There had been a discussion on the policy of the Parliamentary Party. That discussion settled none of the difficulties of the party. They never touched the reason for the want of greater activity, they never touched the reason why Labor members did not raise industrial and social questions more prominently than they did. Whether they liked it or not, the reason was well

known to every Labor member, and it was that there was not a Labor member to-day but knew that he was dependent for his seat in the House of Commons upon the good will of those who belonged to other political parties. As long as they had members returned by Liberal votes they could not expect independent action from their members. Proportional representation would make their members representative of Labor in their own constituencies, it would give them the independence they could not possibly exercise under any other conditions. It would bring honesty for the first time into the political life of this country. . . . He appealed to the delegates with all the strength he had not by their votes to detach themselves from Labor and Socialist opinion throughout the world on this question. Mr. Holmes had spoken not as representing the party to which he belonged. Nor would Mr. MacDonald. The Independent Labor Party by a practically unanimous vote had declared in favor of proportional representation. If they wanted the party to grow in strength, if they wanted to see in the House of Commons strong, independent, virile, and honest Labor representation they would by an overwhelming vote support the resolution.

Mr. J. Ramsay MacDonald, M. P., said that whatever might be their individual views on this matter, they would all agree that they had had a very interesting and not an unimportant debate.

The resolution was put to a card vote and declared defeated, the result being:

For	704,000
Against	1,387,000

The Alternative Vote

In pursuance of a previous decision, the chairman put the question for and against the alternative vote as an elec-

toral reform, and on a card vote the result was as follows:

For	632,000
Against	1,324,000

Thus proportional representation and the alternative vote each secured approximately one-third of the votes of the Congress. *At least* one-third opposed both propositions (how many more is uncertain, since some voters may have *avored* both measures).

CHAPTER XVI

“MUNICIPAL SOCIALISM”

MUNICIPAL Socialism usually means municipal ownership, and the same considerations apply to it as have been treated under the head, “Government Ownership.” However, the modern municipality is in reality—to some degree—a small society, and many of the other problems treated in the preceding chapters also recur in municipal politics: the high cost of living, taxation, political reform, etc. The whole problem of political tactics and of co-operation with other parties (which we have treated in Part I) also recurs in municipal elections. But we have placed the municipal phase of this discussion in the present chapter because co-operation with other parties may be favored in municipal politics, while opposed in national elections.

I. THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF PARIS, 1900

Concerning Socialist action in municipalities, the International Congress of Paris (1900) declared:

By “municipal Socialism” is not to be understood a special kind of Socialism, but only the application of the general principles of Socialism to a special domain of political activity.

The reforms which fall under it are not and cannot be presented as realizing a collectivist society. They are presented, however, as means that the Socialists can and should utilize for preparing and facilitating the coming of that society. The municipality may become an excellent laboratory of decentralized economic life, and at the same time a formidable political fortress for the

use of Socialist majorities against the bourgeois majority of the central government as soon as a considerable degree of autonomy is realized.

And further:

That it is the duty of all Socialists, without depreciating the importance of general politics, to cause to be used and appreciated the importance of municipal activity, to give to municipal reforms the importance that they possess as the embryos of a collectivist society, and to set to work to undertake municipal services: Urban transportation, waterworks, lighting, power, baths, bathing, municipal stores, municipal bakeries, provisions, food, teaching, medical services, heating, housing, clothing, police, municipal works, etc., to make of these services model institutions, both from the point of view of the interest of the public and from that of citizens who are employed in them; the Congress declares that those municipalities which are too weak to proceed alone in the realization of these measures should be joined together in municipal federations, and that in the countries in which the political system does not allow municipalities to proceed along this path, all elected officials of the Socialists should make use of their power to give to the municipalities sufficient liberty and independence to realize these reforms.

II. THE BERLIN MUNICIPAL ELECTION, NOVEMBER, 1913

(From an editorial in *Vorwaerts*)

"The municipality is the seat of the inner life of a people, the anvil upon which the noblest instincts of man should be formed and developed. No adult male citizen of good character should be deprived of his rights as a citizen of his municipality; the right to vote should not be restricted by a census."

This statement, signed by T. von Bethmann Hollweg and the Counts Arnim, Doehne, and Itzenplitz, is characteristic of the change that has taken place in the political views of our bourgeois parties. When the statement was published in 1848, the Conservatives held views regarding municipal political questions which are propagated to-day only by the Social Democrats. The industrial development of the decades that follow, making out

of the half-feudal, agrarian Prussia one of the greatest industrial countries of the world, . . . has caused this change in the Conservative attitude.

In the year 1876 a Conservative representative . . . Haken, coined the Conservative phrase, "He who would rule with us should pay with us," thus denying the words of his own comrades of 1848. . . .

Industrial development . . . has brought about not only the growth of the capitalist class, but has inevitably strengthened by its own growth the modern proletariat in numbers, power, and self-confidence. In 1878 the Social Democratic workers of Berlin for the first time participated in a municipal election. In 1884, the first five Social Democratic municipal representatives entered the Red House, and since then the number of Socialist votes and the number of Socialist representatives has increased from year to year.

In 1900 and 1901, our comrades started debates in the Berlin city hall concerning the three-class suffrage and democratic suffrage. At that time the Conservative phrase of 1876 had already become the property of the Liberal movement. Proudly and earnestly Herr Cassel announced: "The city government has always been of the opinion that he who would rule with us should pay with us!"

As they have deserted their colors in the suffrage question, so the Progressives have failed in all other political fields. . . . Our bourgeois and municipal bureaucrats are not upholders of the modern reform movements whose fundamental principle is that active participation by municipal and state government in social activities shall be the means of uplifting the mental, moral, and physical strength of the nation. . . . Political considerations enter constantly into the question whenever industrial problems are discussed. . . .

In recent years the Progressives in the Berlin city hall have gradually become reconciled to the fact that the seats in third-class districts, which have once become Social Democratic will always remain so. . . . Not only the three districts we have just mentioned must be won to-morrow, but the influence of our representatives must be increased by a marked increase of votes. Our representatives cannot, out of their own strength, enforce reforms and improvements for the working-class. The Social Democratic representatives do not as yet form even a third of

the assembly. They are opposed by 96 representatives elected by first- and second-class voters, who practically without exception represent capitalist interests. Only by arousing the public conscience, only by forcing these men to recognize that the great mass of the Berlin population stands behind this Socialist minority, can we hope to force the assembly to do its duty toward the city. The higher the vote polled by the Socialist candidates the greater will be the effectiveness of the work our representatives can accomplish.

A municipal government, such as that of Berlin, with the tremendous intellectual and material resources at its disposal, a municipality whose budget is exceeded only by that of the Kingdoms of Prussia and Bavaria, is easily able to influence to a marked degree the standard of living of its population. Through the lives of its people, from the cradle to the grave, it can lend a helping hand, by fulfilling its social obligations. . . .

No one who knows the circumstances will deny that the work of our representatives in this direction has been far from fruitless. The former chairman of the assembly, the aged Langerhans, said at one time: "If we did not have the Social Democracy we should have to invent it." This is only one of many tributes paid by our opponents to our work in the Berlin city council. Even the Prussian Government seems in its heart of hearts only half dissatisfied with the work of the Socialist representatives. The general secretary of the propaganda committee for Greater Berlin, Dr. Hegemann, said in one of his articles: "Those who to-day confer with the Government as to the possibility of inaugurating municipal reform measures, smile involuntarily at the reassuring tone in which they are referred to the Social Democrats as trustworthy upholders of the reform measure in question."

We have only just begun to force private capitalist interests into the background of our municipal government; we have just begun to enforce municipal ownership of light and power stations, of all new transit facilities. The completion of these beginnings will cost many a bitter struggle. . . .

The Berlin council has steadily refused to consider the question of unemployment insurance, has refused to do anything to lighten in the least the lot of the man who is unable to find work, in spite of constant pressure from our representatives. At present a period of unemployment, such as Berlin has never

seen before, is breaking in upon us. Want and suffering, great enough even now, will increase during the winter months to such a degree that even the greatest sacrifices on the part of our labor unions will not be able to combat them. With folded arms our municipality looks down upon the needs of a great part of its population.

Attempts have been made to hasten the construction of public buildings, but beyond that every motion to render assistance has been defeated. It was decided that the whole question of unemployment insurance belonged to the state and the nation and not to the municipality. This pretty game of "button, button, who has the button," will go on forever if the masses do not protest. Unemployment is a necessary product of capitalist production and can be done away with only when a Socialist form of society takes the place of modern capitalism. Nevertheless, it should be the duty of those who enjoy the fruits of the present social system to help those who must pay the penalty in the crisis caused by capitalistic production.

The representatives of the other capitalist parties are entirely satisfied with the present conditions. It will be the first duty of the Socialist group to force the question of unemployment insurance upon their attention, not to let the matter rest until something has been done. To-morrow's election must be a mighty demonstration. The great class of those who have nothing but their labor power must give to the demands of the Socialist group the necessary support and significance. . . .

III. THE FRENCH PARTY'S MUNICIPAL PROGRAM, 1912

Whereas, the municipality may become an excellent laboratory of decentralized economic life, as well as a political stronghold; provided that by municipal Socialism is meant only the application of the general principles of Socialism to our particular domain of political action; provided that the various reforms are presented as functioning in a domain that Socialists should avail themselves according to the economic nature of each municipality in order to facilitate the coming of the future society; therefore, the Socialist Party, pursuing its aim of the establishment of collective property, national, regional, or municipal, as the case may be, in order to attain its end, makes use of all

means of action, including the effort to capture the municipalities with its program of demands, as follows:

1. POLITICAL

- a) Proportional representation.
- b) Development of the economic importance of the municipality and abrogation of all the legal obstacles to the extension of its commercial and industrial functions.
- c) Revision of the laws of eminent domain in order to facilitate measures necessary to the hygiene and sanitation of cities.
- d) Extension of the recognized right of the municipalities to appoint intermunicipal unions and federations among unions.
- e) The referendum as applied to municipal affairs.

2. ECONOMIC

- a) A return to the municipality of public service monopolies already granted.
- b) Extension of direct taxes and of the agricultural and industrial domain of the municipalities.
- c) Founding of local industries by the municipalities by supplying of tools, reasonable credit, and means of preservation, transport, and storage.
- d) Formal recognition of the right to organize in unions, and eight-hour workday for employees and workers of the municipality. Weekly rest day and fixing of a minimum wage on the basis established by labor unions of the vicinity.
- e) Introduction in the specifications of public works of clauses imposing these conditions. Prohibition of leased contract work.
- f) Creation of a service of labor statistics and free employment agencies.
- g) Subsidizing of all the works of the unions and notably of strike funds.

3. FINANCIAL

- a) Reform of the taxes which especially oppress the working-class; exemption of families paying low rents from the personal tax. Abolition of the octroi, at least on foodstuffs, and liberty

of choice of substitute taxes, graduation of municipal taxes, with exemption of those at the bottom.

b) Establishment of a municipal tax upon the sale of land and buildings, proportionate to the increase in value of the land and buildings created by the carrying on of public works.

c) Organization of municipal and inter-municipal insurance against fire and other risks.

d) Increase in the royalties on mining lands and a system of payments for the use of natural motor forces.

4. EDUCATION

a) Furnishing of free books and other school materials, and also of lunches, cloak rooms, baths, and kindergartens.

b) Creation and subsidizing of school and graduation scholarships.

c) Admission to all grades of instruction by means of scholarships and competitive tests.

5. CHARITY

Transformation of public charity to make it more responsible to human dignity and solidarity.

Free service of legal, administrative, and fiscal advice.

In order to reserve to the proletariat the benefit of the application of the law concerning workingmen's pensions; encouragement to the industrial unions in the forming of a regional union treasury.

6. HEALTH AND HOUSING

Establishment of free public baths and lavatories.

Broadening of narrow streets and sanitation of dumping places.

Supervision of dwellings, workshops, water, and food supply.

Direct administration of markets and warehouses and extension of direct exchange of products with the agricultural union. Construction by the municipalities of cheap but sanitary dwellings.

The inalienability of public land. Its use by the municipality for the benefit of the municipality.

IV. CO-OPERATION WITH OTHER PARTIES IN MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS. ITALIAN PARTY CONGRESS, 1914

1. DISCUSSION IN THE CONGRESS

A heated discussion for and against the making of electoral alliances took place at the Italian Socialist Congress of 1914, Lucci favoring such alliances, Ralli opposing.

Lucci took Naples as an example of the city where alliances were desirable. Out of the 700,000 inhabitants, there were hardly 100 organized Socialists. The executive committee of the party, at the last parliamentary elections, demanded that a party candidate should run for office in each election district.

He declared:

Through this measure the instinct of rebellion in Naples turned to our party just as it would have turned towards the anarchists had they addressed the people. We appealed to this instinct, spoke of our aims to the illiterate mass, said that we wished to fight for better housing, bread, and honest administration. Now the party steps in and says: "You are not allowed to do anything for these people. The Party Congress forbids it. In the South, politically speaking, we are before the stone period. The South is without industry—it contains no proletariat, only a mob. The people have no human dignity, they have no bread to eat! And we are to tell them: 'The Congress of Ancona has decided that you must win the city administration without compromise.' With this action we mock misery. Here we find 80 town councilors, 170 public benevolent institutions, almost 1,000 positions to fill! And to fill with capable, decent human beings!" [Interrupter: "With whom do you wish to form an alliance?"] The speaker, with emphasis: "With the devil! Surely not with the employers; they don't want us. There is no large industry in Naples. With the decent elements of the democracy." (Excitement.)

Ralli defended the opposite view. He asserted that the proletariat in Naples had not been taught Socialism, and

asked how the workers shall get an idea of the class struggle if they unite with the bourgeoisie. He asserted that Lucci was stronger on reform than Bissolati and told of the failure of political alliances. A number of others engaged in the debate.

The vote, taken at the conclusion of the discussion, was as follows: for Ralli's resolution against any kind of alliance, 22,591; for Mazzoni's resolution, which permitted election alliances under the decision of the provincial party congress, 8,584; for Modigliani's resolution, for alliances with labor and professional organizations, 3,214.

2. THE RESOLUTION ADOPTED:

The Congress expresses the wish that the party shall resolutely set about making one of the commune as an organ of proletarian claims and conquests, in *opposition to all the bourgeois parties*; by means of

1. Intense political and parliamentary action, which, while it defends day by day the acts of the Socialist communal administration, shall aim to render the commune able and free to give effect to the Socialist municipal program;

2. An active propaganda among the workers intended to develop their class-consciousness and to spread a knowledge of the local political program of the party;

3. Capture of the communal administrations, wherever the forces of the party and the class-consciousness of the proletariat are advanced enough to maintain and defend the positions captured, in the interest of the working-class and in opposition to the bourgeois arrogance, whether individuals or class.

4. A struggle to capture the minority in all the other communes with the declared purposes of criticising and of Socialist preparation, and to develop the skill of individual members of the party for the work of bringing to birth what may be economically necessary in the communes.

3. CRITICISM BY ODA OLBERG IN "DIE NEUE ZEIT"

"The program of Ralli, which passed by a majority of 22,591 against 11,798 votes, forbids, once for all and without any exception for special cases, the formation of election alliances with other parties.

"Italy, in round figures, has 8,000 communes. Among these are large industrial centers, like Milan, Turin, and Genoa, cities like Rome, mountain villages in the Alps, seaports in Sicily, and places in which the agrarian workers live in large numbers. Many of these are without water supply, without a canal system, without hospitals, with pauper graves for the poor; and, contrasting with these, are elegant cosmopolitan towns and health resorts with all up-to-date comforts for the wealthy class. These 8,000 communes are all to be treated alike. The miserable holes of Calabria, with its illiterate people, whom hunger drives to emigration, shall be subject to the same rules as the highly developed communes of the Emilia, which have been managed by our party for two decades.

"In the communities of Emilia one cannot find an unorganized workman; there one can see how the working-class, through its conquest of the communal offices, stands up for its class interests in a way which frightens the bourgeoisie.

"This position of an absolute 'no compromise' for all parts of Italy was most strongly advocated by Comrade Ralli. He defended his views in a very valuable program, which claims that the consciousness of the masses would be seriously confused if they should be offered as allies those parties which were represented to them as enemies in the parliamentary elections. Nobody can overlook the importance of this objection. But, as the facts do not appear as simple and straightforward as is desirable for

pedagogical purposes, the question arises if it would not be better to uncover contradictions that really exist instead of covering them up.

“Communal politics and parliamentary politics are different things, not because the so-called interests of the nation are discussed in Parliament and only those of a town or village in the communal administration, but because the communal administration possesses executive power, both in accordance with law and in fact, to a larger degree than Parliament. Parliament fights for laws, for fundamental and definite things; in a communal administration naked interests clash, and what is called application and interpretation of the law is frequently nothing but evasion. The election fight in a commune often stands on a much lower level than the parliamentary one. Comrade Lucci says in his speech that in South Italy it is frequently necessary to prevent the mayor of a town from letting his manure pollute the public water supply. In Parliament there are no organizations to be guarded, no workingmen’s quarters to be provided with trolleys, no funds to be raised for hospitals. In communes there are bands of thieves to be turned out of benevolent institutions, the rudiments of life must be defended, and precautions must be taken against crimes of the ruling clique.

“It is of course not impossible that these communes might be cleaned up by Socialistic powers or after Socialistic methods, though it has nothing to do with Socialism that the mayor of the town does not steal, and that the seller of drinking water pays the town councilors for not putting in a proper water-supply system. But suppose that in a *milieu* like this only the most meager beginning of a Socialist movement exists? Shall the party in such a case pay no attention to the new, partly illiterate voting population; shall it, because the number of organized party

comrades is not large enough to form a city administration, abandon it to a bourgeois clique? Shall it say to these miserable masses: We mean to develop a new society of the free and equal, but for the present we can do nothing for you? For the time being you had better die of typhoid and dysentery, live in hovels, which mock the dignity of human nature, throw your dead into a common grave, pay the taxes by which the propertied class pays for its luxuries?

"Comrade Lucci, at the Congress of Ancona, chose Naples, the largest city in Italy, as an example. There the party has but little more than one hundred members. At the parliamentary elections, the discontent of the masses, in instinctive rebellion against centuries of wrong, turned expectantly to our party. Three Socialists were elected, one of them a party comrade (Lucci). Now the city elections are before us. Almost 1,000 offices are to be filled, if the party will assume the administration of the commune, which it has a chance to win. This goal can be reached by uniting with the parties of the extreme Left; alone it is powerless. Now the Party Congress gives the order for 'No compromise, for renunciation.' It says the party shall not assist in a work which it cannot master alone. All the power that the general suffrage puts into the hands of the proletarians shall be left quietly to the bourgeoisie wherever our party cannot undertake with its own candidates and its own program the city administration. The impulse of the masses, who want to intrust themselves to our guidance, must not concern us; we will realize their hopes in a future state.

"It is to be foreseen with certainty that this vote will force our party to new expulsions. Naples and many other towns will, in spite of the resolution of the Congress, wage the communal election war by means of a coalition. They

will commit all the unavoidable errors and suffer all the disappointments which go with compromise.”

4. THE MUNICIPAL PROGRAM

Almost without discussion, a resolution proposed by the committee, Casalini, Della Seta, and Siehel, in regard to the Socialist communal program, was adopted. This resolution proposes for the party communal activity the following program:

(1) Communal autonomy; (2) the improvement of the public school system, school restaurants, school libraries; (3) political agitation for lowering taxes on provisions, establishment of municipal slaughter-houses and bakeries, communal publications of prices of provisions; (4) taking charge of public service in municipal affairs; (5) erection of inexpensive and healthy workmen's dwellings; (6) support of working-class arrangements, improvement of hospitals, protection of motherhood and children, hygienic education of the masses; (7) policy of the working-class, recognition of organizations among employees and workers in the service of the commune, stipulation about wages and workers' protection in giving out public works, communal workers' agencies, support of the unemployed.

V. THE ITALIAN MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS OF 1914

1. GENERAL RESULTS

(From *Le Peuple*, Brussels)

“The municipal elections in the great cities that have voted up to the present have unfortunately resulted in the success of the Clerical-Conservative Alliance in most of them. In Rome the list of these parties obtained from 31,000 to 33,000 votes, the list of the Democratic *bloc* from 25,000 to 28,000, while the Socialist list found only 2,600 to 3,600 supporters. The result of this decisive defeat is

the establishment of capitalist control of the city administration, which is clearly shown by the rise in the shares of the Rome Tramway Co. (11 points) and the Gas Co. (8 points) the day after the result was known. The municipal electricity works and the municipal tramways, which were started during the time that the Democratic *bloc* had control, largely through the endeavors of our late Comrade Montemartini, will probably be sold to the companies, which have every reason to desire the elimination of this competition, seeing that the result of their working caused a drop in the shares of the Gas Co. (which also runs an electricity works) from 1,075 to 920 lire, and of the Tramway Co.'s shares from 263 to 151 lire.

“Compared with the Socialist vote cast at the general election for Parliament, the average of 3,000 votes given for the Socialist list is deplorable. The only explanation is that the bulk of the Socialist voters, realizing the impossibility of carrying the Socialist list, with its bid for the majority of seats, voted for the Democratic list to keep out the Clericals, thus disobeying the resolution of the Ancona Congress. This supposition is borne out by the figures, for the Democratic vote increased nearly as much as the Socialist vote fell compared with the general election.

“In Turin the Conservative list was successful, but the Socialist vote was only very slightly lower; the same was the case in Genoa, where the Clerical Party secured control. In both cities the Socialist Party get the minority seats. In Milan the party succeeded in gaining the 64 majority seats by 33,000 against 30,000 votes, the 16 minority seats falling to the Constitutional list. Milan will therefore be the first great city in Europe with a Socialist administration. There are good hopes that a number of medium-sized and small towns may be carried on the

Ancona plan, but there is small chance of success in Florence, Venice, and Palermo. In Naples, as was stated by us some weeks ago, the Socialist organization has withdrawn from the party, so as to be able to combine with the Democratic *bloc*."

2. THE VICTORIES AT NAPLES AND ANCONA. TWO IMPORTANT COMMUNAL ELECTION TRIUMPHS

(From *Vorwaerts*)

"The communal elections which occurred on July 12, in which our party maintained its ground successfully, have been marked by two results of great significance and importance: the victory of the Democratic *bloc* in Naples and the union of people's parties in Ancona. The outcome of the election in Naples insures, finally, the wresting of the administration of Italy's greatest city from that notorious gang whose misrule has so often furnished a theme for both the domestic and foreign press. The Socialists, Republicans, and city Radicals combined have gained control over the city administration, and are thus in a position, finally, to offer the poor Neapolitans the possibility of freeing themselves in a lawful way from the governing Camorra of the dominant clique, which, at the very least, is just as pernicious as the Camorra of the proletarian ruff-raff. It is worthy of note, in this connection, that the victory was secured as a result of the union of all the people's parties, and that in order to contribute their support to the movement, the Neapolitan Socialists were forced to withdraw from the party, as the Ancona Congress had placed a ban, once for all, upon any sort of election combination. The views of Lucci, the Socialist deputy, were confirmed by this result. At the last Congress he declared that the Socialists at Naples, in order

to establish an administration, did not lack voting strength but only candidates. In fact, the Socialist candidates received the greatest number of votes.

"While the contest at the Naples election had great practical significance, events at Ancona had much theoretical importance. Here also there was a combination made between the Socialists and Republicans, while the anarchists, as a matter of principle, held aloof. This alliance, however, has been approved by the party council in view of the exceptional situation which, under the attack of the reactionaries, obtained in Ancona. The candidates of the Socialist-Republican *bloc*, without exception, fell victims to persistent police persecution and spying which followed the revolutionary days in June, and before long the greater part found themselves in custody. It is indeed an impressive indication of the strength and solidarity of the revolutionary movement at Ancona that at a time such as the present the reactionaries, when under imminent terror, had mobilized all resistance, it can win the city election and elect just those persons upon whom the bourgeoisie had determined to wreak their vengeance. The Government, however, does not seem to understand the *Mene Tekel*, which is contained in the occurrences at the Ancona election; it is proceeding in the Marches and in Romagna with further arrests. Reaction is indeed playing a very dangerous game."

3. THE GENERAL STRIKE AND THE MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS

By Oda Olberg

(In *Die Neue Zeit*, July, 1914)

"It is an illuminating fact that a mass movement like that of the previous June not only indicated a sharp intensification of class positions but led to a still further

intensification. In fact, reaction rules everywhere. The bourgeoisie, which is continuing the war in Cyrenaica, and would like to wage war in Albania, pretends that the future of the country is endangered by the revolutionary tide. It is binding together craftily its persecution of the organizations of the prolateriat with preparations for new war adventures. For it is justifying its calling of the reserves in preparation for Albania by the pretense that a railway strike is being planned.

“Nevertheless, it would be a mistake, in our opinion, to attribute the numerous losses of our party at the municipal elections this summer as principally due to the strike panic. . . . This unfortunate result is much more due to the electoral tactics of the party than to the general strike. At the Congress of Ancona it was resolved to enter into the municipal elections without any allies. . . . It is said to justify these tactics that we should not wish to appear stronger than we are. But it would be more profitable to the proletariat to make its power count as much as possible instead of merely renouncing all effort to exert and direct influence on city administrations. It is certainly not for the benefit of the Roman proletariat to appear to its enemies as weak as it is shown to be in the last elections.

“In spite of the general strike panic, the party obtained great successes in Milan and Bologna, as well as smaller places. . . . Where our organization is very strong, these tactics have justified themselves. In other places they have robbed the party of all influence whatever. In Ancona, finally, notwithstanding the decision of the Party Congress, the Socialists and Republicans opposed the united reaction by means of an alliance, and so succeeded in obtaining, for a mere protest candidate, a majority of 2,000 votes. . . .

"So the general strike did not create a new political situation. It only threw into stronger light the results of the war [in Africa]. The party is isolated because the reaction is on its guard, but the more this situation becomes clear the more impossible it becomes for the bourgeois democracy to make common cause with the reaction. The isolation of the party, brought about years ago by the power of circumstances, will sooner or later become once more a question for our party tactics and will no longer be a fact that exists independently of its will. In order to offer effective opposition to the reaction, shall the party once more join with the bourgeois radicals?"

VI. THE MUNICIPAL PROGRAM IN THE UNITED STATES

The question of a municipal program has already become one of considerable importance to the Socialist movement of the United States on account of the Socialist victories in Milwaukee, Butte, Schenectady, Berkeley, and elsewhere, shortlived as some of these victories have been. As in the case of the state platform, a committee was appointed by the 1912 Convention to prepare a municipal program to be recommended to local party organizations. A committee was appointed also to investigate the commission form of government for cities and in the following year to draw up a plan for a model city charter on Socialist principles. Extracts from the reports of these committees are given below.*

1. REPORT OF COMMISSION FORM OF GOVERNMENT, CONVENTION OF 1912

This report gives first a careful treatment of the extent and growth of the commission form of government, the

* We have freely introduced italics in this section.

cities that have adopted or rejected it, the essential and non-essential features, and the results. Then follow the arguments for and against commission government from the Socialist point of view.*

a. *Objectionable Features*

There are three principal objections to the commission form of government. There are many minor points that are objectionable, but they are matters of detail. The report reads:

(1) *Extreme Concentration*.—Extreme concentration of power is regarded by all critics of the commission form of government as its most dangerous and objectionable feature. Reducing the number of officials to five, the commission form combines the legislative, executive, and judicial functions. It combines the tax-llevying, appropriating, and expending powers. In addition, it gives this small governing commission all of the appointive power, including not only the right to appoint all municipal appointees but to remove them, to create new positions or discontinue them, to fix salaries and prescribe all official duties, alter or transfer them. Thus it not only gives this small group of five men almost complete control of the entire municipal affairs, but it also makes all of the city employees practically the agents and dependents of the commission.

This is concentration with a vengeance. Nothing of the sort has been attempted in modern times anywhere in the world. . . . With the tendency of modern years everywhere in the direction of greater democracy, the commission form of government comes with a tendency back again towards the old idea of the rule by the few and power in the hands of the few.

In reply to this objection, the friends of the commission form of government always urge that it has incorporated the initiative, referendum, and the recall, which are the instruments of modern democracy. It is doubtful, however, whether these features constitute a sufficient safeguard against the dangers of

*Report of Convention of 1912, p. 179.

concentration. And, besides, there is reason to doubt the wisdom of so radical a departure from the democratic form of government as will compel the people to depend upon these devices as their only possible escape from the tyranny of autocracy. . . .

(2) *The Non-Partisan Fallacy*.—The elimination of parties is also a seriously objectionable feature. There can be no greater fallacy than the so-called non-partisan idea. . . . Such a proposition would take out of civic life the responsibility of fighting together for principles. By eliminating all designations by which people would work together for some principle or idea, municipal campaigns would be thrown back again upon the worst elements in our political life. . . .

It may be quite true that neither the Republican nor the Democratic national parties have anything in their platforms or programs looking to the relief of the people that live in cities. . . .

Such is not the case with the Socialist Party. It has a program—municipal, state, and national. And they are a part of one consistent whole. The same principles for which the Socialist Party stands in the state and nation apply with equal force, though with different details, to the city as well. And what is more, there is no solution of municipal problems apart from the principles of social democracy. And the principles of social democracy cannot be applied except through state and national action. The effort, therefore, to eliminate national and state issues and to prevent the organization of a state and national political party that shall have also a municipal program, is to block the way to a final solution of the problems of municipal government.

(3) *Elimination of Minority Representation*.—The elimination of minority representation is another serious objection to the commission form of government which is urged by all its critics. By abolishing ward representation and electing the commissioners at large, the possibility of a minority party securing a representation is destroyed. This is particularly true with regard to the working-class. In the nature of the case, certain wards in our cities are inhabited by the working-class. Other wards are inhabited mostly by the capitalistic class. Under the method of ward organization there are sure to be some wards where the working-class predominate and where, therefore, they can secure representation long before they are able to capture the city. This

minority representation serves not only to give the working-class a voice in the government to that extent, but it affords the working-class experience in public affairs.

All of this is sacrificed by the commission form of government and, we believe, is a serious loss.

b. *Desirable Forms and Features of Municipal Government*

In connection with the commission form of government are a number of features which all must agree are desirable. This fact requires discrimination in stating the position which the Socialist Party should take. *If the party, either locally or otherwise, takes a stand against the commission form of government unqualifiedly, it thereby puts itself in opposition to certain desirable features that have been attached to the commission form. It is necessary, therefore, to study carefully the form and the various features of each particular city charter and the general state act as it comes forward. The attitude that the party is to take in any city or state can be determined by the particular form and the specific features of the commission form proposed.*

(1) *Home Rule*.—Wherever the general state acts establishing the commission form of government propose a greater degree of home rule than the cities in that state already enjoy, the party will have to consider seriously whether such a law, even though objectionable in some other features, will not be to the advantage of the cities in the state. Above almost everything else, home rule and the right of self-government, the right of the city to manage its own affairs, is most important. Especially in the fight for municipal ownership, for direct employment, for trades-union conditions of labor, the union label, the union scale, the eight-hour day, and union conditions, home rule is essential.

Many of the commission charters, so far as we can discover, do not add one iota of home rule to the city's power. Many of the states have secured home rule entirely apart from the commission form, and we believe the rest of the states would in time secure the same. Where the cities do not yet enjoy home rule, and the state law establishing the commission form does give the city more home rule, there the party should consider seriously whether it is not better to support the commission form on that account. And this will have to be determined in each

case by a careful and discriminate estimate of the degree of home rule secured, and the question of whether there are other objectionable features that overbalance the possible advantages of the home rule involved.

(2) *The Initiative, Referendum, and Recall.*—The Socialist Party everywhere, of course, is seeking to establish direct legislation and greater control by the people over the Government. The initiative, referendum, and recall are means to that end. They are proposed in connection with the commission form in the great majority of cases. Here, again, the party will have to exercise discriminating judgment in determining its attitude.

Some matters are clear, however. Where any of these forms are missing in the proposed charter or state law, there the party should make a vigorous fight to have them included. And where the percentages are too high, the party should fight for their reduction. In our opinion, the initiative should not require the signatures of more than 10 per cent of the voters; the referendum should not require more than 15 per cent, and the recall should not require more than 20 per cent. These figures, however, are arbitrary, but are the figures that are coming to be regarded by the friends of direct legislation as being nearest the desired point. The percentages should not be so high as to make the devices too difficult of putting into operation, nor should they be so low as to interfere with the efficient operation of the municipal government.

(3) *Size of the Governing Body.*—In the smaller cities, the five members proposed by the commission form are doubtless sufficient. It is desirable to keep the forms of government as simple as the situation will warrant. But in the larger cities we do not believe the small body of five men is sufficient to insure efficiency. . . . For the large cities, your committee would recommend a modification of the present form of municipal government, drawn from the best experiences of European and American cities in this respect rather than the commission form.

(4) *Salaries.*—One good feature of the commission form of government is the fact that it generally provides for a salary for the elected commissioners and large enough to attract men of capacity into the public service and to enable them to devote their entire time to it. This we believe to be essential. Without salaries for public officials, the working-class can hardly ever hope to take any part in civic life. The necessity of earning

a living and the difficulty attendant thereto makes it impossible for them to devote their time to the public service. The failure to provide salaries, therefore, results either in office-holding becoming the special privilege of the wealthy class, or it deteriorates into something worse. The provision of adequate salaries we believe to be an essential feature of municipal government.

(5) *Selecting the Heads of Departments.*—One serious and objectionable feature of most of the commission form charters and laws is the fact that the five commissioners are elected without any reference to the work that they are to perform and are allowed afterwards to decide among themselves which men are to be put at the head of the five respective departments. A few of the commission charters, however, have remedied this defect. . . .

In Conclusion.—The study of the movement for the commission form of government for cities in America reveals the fact that the forms proposed vary greatly in detail. Indeed there is a great variation even in essential features. Furthermore, the form itself has been passing through the process of modification since its inception. This change and modification is still going on. There has not yet been proposed a final and definite form of the commission form of government; the whole matter is in process of development.

In view of these facts, it is impossible at the present time, we believe, to lay down or to fix any definite policy that shall apply equally to all the states and all of the cities with reference to this matter. Certain general principles may be stated. Certain errors and fallacies of the arguments may be pointed out, certain evils opposed. And where the form is entirely objectionable, it may be defeated.

In some cases the Socialist Party organizations have already used their influence against certain objectionable forms and defeated them. In other cases they have compelled a modification of the form by insisting on the introduction of certain features that had been omitted. And so far as *your committee can see, this discriminating attitude, varying with the conditions that concern the party in different localities, and varying as the movement varies, will have to be the position of the party.*

One thing, however, your committee would recommend, viz., That a committee be appointed by the Convention to study further

the best forms of municipal government and to submit the results of their work as *a basis for a form that may be proposed as an alternative and improvement upon the commission plan.* (Italics ours.)

c. Discussion of Report in Convention

The above report brought forth extended discussion. The opinion of certain delegates was voiced by Patterson, of Ohio:

I am opposed to the commission form of government for several reasons. One reason is that this is a reform movement; a substitute for Socialism; especially adapted for advantageous use by the capitalist class in a community where there is no reform movement outside of the Socialist Party. Then they build that up as one. The thing that the Socialist wants is class lines clearly drawn. They cannot be drawn by obliterating party lines.

The greater number of speakers, however, especially those somewhat experienced in the commission form of government, opposed its unqualified rejection by Socialists.

Delegate Le Suer [North Dakota]: *There are some objections in this report to the commission form of government that are not well taken or well founded. One of them, for instance, is that the commission form does away with minority representation.* Nothing could be further from the truth. Take the council form of government, where you elect by wards, and there you have 51 per cent in each ward represented and the other 49 per cent unrepresented. If there are three tickets, 35 per cent may elect and the other 65 be unrepresented. But when the commission form is adopted there is a provision in the law in our state that does give you real minority representation. It is provided for by the cumulative system of voting which is not commented upon here. The committee seems to have had no information on the cumulative system of voting in many commission cities. That provides for minority representation. That is to say, if three or four commissioners are to be elected, the voter has the right to cast one vote for each commissioner who

is to be elected; but the voter may, if he choose, cast all his votes for one candidate, and that gives you real, practical, democratic minority representation. Now you all ought to know that.

Again, with reference to the non-partisan feature. . . . It has been our experience in our town that the Socialist Party organization is the only party organization that can maintain its efficiency and its integrity and hold its party together without the party name on the ballot. We have demonstrated that at least in North Dakota the Socialists can do that and can survive and flourish in the face of a non-partisan ballot.

Delegate Wilson [California]: . . . I speak to you as one having some experience with the commission form of government. The city of Berkeley is so administered. The new charter has been in effect now for four years; and we are now working under that charter. And with the experience that we have had in the city of Berkeley and the other cities of California where the commission form of government is established, I wish to say that from my experience and observation that I am profoundly convinced that *the commission form of government is superior for our purposes as Socialists to any other previous form of city organization.*

A Delegate: Provided Socialists are in power.

Delegate Wilson: I will take up that point in a minute. I am now giving you my experience. In the first place, we found this: that in every city in the state of California where we were conducting a campaign with the non-partisan ballot, the short ballot and the non-partisan ballot, . . . that the only political organization that could hold its strength through the campaign, both primary and final, was the Socialist organization.

Delegate Spargo [Vermont]: I favor the motion to adopt the report and continue the committee. I am also strongly in favor of the recommendation made by Comrade Wilson, namely, that we should not carry on, as we have been doing in this country, an anti-commission form propaganda; and so place the national party on that side of the question at this time. I believe the commission form of government is as inevitable in politics as is the trust in industry. *I believe that the opposition to the commission form of government per se is just as insensible in the*

realm of politics as is the opposition to the trust in the realm of industrial development.

The question was then put on the amendment, *that the matter of indorsing the commission form of government be left to the states.* The amendment was adopted by a vote of 134 to 64. (Italics ours.)

2. A MODEL CITY CHARTER

The committee on the commission form of government was continued at the Convention of 1912 and instructed to work out *a form of municipal government that would be consistent with the party principles.* Accordingly a tentative draft of a city charter was submitted to this committee in 1913 by the secretary, Carl D. Thompson. No action on the matter has yet been taken.

While the tentative charter in full cannot be here given, we present here its preliminary principles and features:

Principles of Charter Making

Two principles, it seems to us, should be emphasized in all efforts to develop a better form of municipal government:

1. As a city grows in area and population its distinctive problems increase in number, volume, and complexity. The organization of government, the number of officials or departments and their co-ordination must vary accordingly. A city of 3,000 population needs only a very simple governmental organization. But a city of 300,000 will require a much more highly organized and specialized governmental body.

Furthermore, the modern city is developing in another respect: It is adding new functions all the time. More and more enterprises that were formerly conducted by private concerns are being assumed by the community.

This requirement for adaptation seems lacking in all the plans for municipal government so far suggested by those favoring the commission plan.

2. The second principle that is fundamental in charter making

is the distinction between the policy determining and the administering functions of city government. The policy determining function requires that provision should be made for direct control by the people,—as great a degree of democracy as possible and as nearly a true representation of the existing elements and interests in the community as possible. The administering function of the government, on the other hand, requires efficiency, specialized ability, technical knowledge, training, and experience. These two functions should, therefore, be separated and proper provision made for both in the form of government. This is done by the representative council plan referred to farther on. That feature we approve and shall incorporate in our proposal.

Features of the Charter

During the last few years, four forms of municipal government have been suggested: (1) The commission form; (2) the federal form; (3) the city manager form; (4) and now, last of all, the representative council plan.

Of these four forms, the first three are sufficiently discussed by the report of the committee of the Socialist Party above referred to. The last of the proposed forms seems to us the least objectionable from the Socialist point of view.

The Socialist Plan.—The form of municipal government favored by your committee will include the following features:

1. The most complete home rule that it is possible to obtain under the state laws.
2. *A representative council* elected at large upon the principle of proportional representation.
3. Partisan or designated ballots.
4. A mayor elected by the council, to serve as president of the council and official head of the city government. Such a mayor may act also as manager or chief administering official in smaller cities.
5. *A city manager*, elected by the council, to serve as head of the administrative departments of the city. This to apply especially to larger cities.
6. Departments, number and size depending upon the size and requirements of the city. Heads of each department to be selected by the city manager, subject to the approval of the council.

7. Sub-departments.
8. Commissions.
9. Initiative and referendum.
10. Recall.
11. Complete and adequate power for the regulation of all public utilities, pending the time of full public ownership.
12. Careful provision for complete municipal ownership of all public utilities as far and as fast as state laws and existing conditions will permit.
13. No important franchises to be granted, except approved by direct vote of the people.
14. Direct employment and the abolition of private contracting in public works.
15. Recognition of the rights of municipal employees to organize and maintain union wages, the eight-hour day, and general union-labor conditions.

3. SUGGESTED MUNICIPAL PROGRAM, 1912 CONVENTION

Report of Convention of 1912

I

Labor Measures

- (1) Eight-hour day, trade-union wages and conditions in all public employment and on all contract work done for the city.
- (2) Old-age pension, accident insurance, and sick benefits to be provided for all public employees.
- (3) Special laws for the protection of both women and children, in mercantile, domestic, and industrial pursuits.
- (4) The abolition of child labor.
- (5) Police not to be used to break strikes.
- (6) Rigid inspection of factories by local authorities for the improvement of sanitary conditions, lighting, ventilating, heating, and the like. Safety appliances required in all cases to protect the worker against dangerous machinery.
- (7) Free employment bureaus to be established in the cities to work in co-operation with state bureaus. Abolition of contract system and direct employment by the city on all public works.
- (8) Free legal advice.

(9) The provision of work for the unemployed by the erection of model dwellings for workingmen; the paving and improvement of streets and alleys, and the extension and improvement of parks and playgrounds.

II

Home Rule

(1) Home rule for cities; including the right of the city to own and operate any and all public utilities; to engage in commercial enterprises of any and all kinds; the right of excess condemnation, both within and outside the city, and the right of two or more cities to co-operate in the ownership and management of public utilities; the city to have the right of issuing bonds for these purposes up to 50 per cent of the assessed valuation, or the right to issue mortgage certificates against the property acquired, said certificates not to count against the bonded indebtedness of the city.

III

Municipal Ownership

(1) The city to acquire as rapidly as possible, own and operate its public utilities, especially street car systems, light, heat, and power plants, docks, wharves, etc.

Among the things which may be owned and operated by the city to advantage are slaughter-houses, bakeries, milk depots, coal and wood yards, ice plants, undertaking establishments, and crematories.

On all public works, eight-hour day, trade-union wages, and progressive improvement in the condition of labor to be established and maintained.

IV

City Planning and Housing

(1) The introduction of scientific city planning to provide for the development of cities along the most sanitary, economic, and attractive lines.

(2) The city to secure the ownership of land, to plat the

same so as to provide for plenty of open space, and to erect model dwellings thereon to be rented by the municipality at cost.

(3) Transportation facilities to be maintained with special reference to the prevention of overcrowding in unsanitary tenements and the creation of slum districts.

V

Public Health

(1) Inspection of food.

(2) Sanitary inspection.

(3) Extension of hospital and free medical treatment.

(4) Child welfare department, to combat infant death-rate prevailing especially in working-class sections.

(5) Special attention to eradication of tuberculosis and other contagious diseases.

(6) System of street toilets and public comfort stations.

(7) Adequate system of public baths, parks, playgrounds, and gymnasiums.

VI

Public Education

(1) Adequate number of teachers so that classes may not be too large.

(2) Retirement fund for teachers.

(3) Kindergartens to be established and conducted in connection with all schools.

(4) Adequate school buildings to be provided and maintained.

(5) Ample playgrounds, with instructors in charge.

(6) Free text-books and equipment.

(7) Penny lunches and, where necessary, free meals and clothing.

(8) Medical inspection, including free service in the care of eyes, ears, throat, teeth, and general health where necessary to insure mental efficiency in the educational work, and special inspection to protect the schools from contagion.

(9) Baths and gymnasiums in each school.

(10) Establishment of vacation schools and adequate night schools for adults.

(11) All school buildings to be open or available for the citizens of their respective communities, at any and all times and for any purposes desired by the citizens, so long as such use does not interfere with the regular school work. All schools to serve as centers for social civic, and recreational purposes.

VII

The Liquor Traffic and Vice

(1) Socialization of the liquor traffic; the city to offer as substitute for the social features of the saloon, opportunities for recreation and amusement under wholesome conditions.

(2) Abolition of the restricted vice districts.

VIII

Municipal Markets

Municipal markets to be established where it is found that by this means a reduction may be secured in the cost of the necessities of life.

.

4. MUNICIPAL PLATFORM OF NEW YORK

As an example of a city of the first class and one in which Socialism has not yet gained a share in the administration, we give selections from the municipal program of New York for 1913. We underline novel and important features *not* recommended in the national report:

Transportation

We demand the immediate municipalization of all surface, elevated, and underground railways and all ferries; the existing plant to be acquired at its physical valuation under the right of eminent domain; additions to be constructed by the municipality as fast as practicable to create an adequate system for the entire city; the *whole to be operated by the municipality without profit.*

Cost of Living

As a means of relieving the hardship caused by the general rise of prices, we demand: . . . that the municipality undertake the provision of fuel, ice, milk, bread, and other prime necessities, *selling them at such prices as merely to cover cost of production and distribution.*

Public Works and City Employees

We demand the abolition of the contract system on public work and the substitution of direct employment by the municipality under civil service rules.

We further demand:

That the organization of the employees in the various departments be encouraged and their right to strike recognized, in order to give them a voice in regulating their conditions and an opportunity for the statement and redress of grievances, and also to enlist their technical knowledge and public spirit in a democratic and efficient administration of public affairs.

Strikes

We demand that the licensing of strike-breakers as special deputies be stopped; *that the police power be used to the utmost to protect working-people in their right to strike, to picket peaceably, single or in mass, and to hold meetings and distribute literature in connection with labor disputes; and that the power of the department of health be used to prevent the housing of strike-breakers in factories.*

Public Education

We . . . demand:

The immediate increase of the teaching force and its maintenance at a ratio of not less than one teacher to every twenty pupils on the register;

Increase of salaries for teachers so as to encourage competent instructors to enter and remain in the service and do their best work;

The school authorities to be empowered, in all cases where economic pressure would otherwise compel pupils to leave school before the age of eighteen, to grant pensions conditional on continued attendance to that age;

Free and adequate medical and dental attendance for all pupils;

The introduction of vocational instruction, not separate from or alternative to general education, but so combined with it as to fit all children for useful labor, for the duties of citizenship, and for the enjoyment of civilized life.

.

Unemployment

As a means of equalizing the burden of unemployment, which cannot be altogether removed under the capitalist system, *we demand the establishment of a system of unemployment insurance, conducted as far as possible through workingmen's organizations, with liberal financial aid by the municipality. . . .* (Our italics.)

In four large cities of the United States, the Socialists have held the mayoralty, with more or less control of the municipal administration. In Berkeley and Milwaukee the Socialist régime held through but one term; in Butte, two; in Schenectady, the Socialist Party has recently re-elected several officers, including the mayor and the president of the council. The following extracts from the reports of these mayors will give an idea of the general direction of municipal achievement among the Socialists, with the difficulties under which the party labors.

5. SOCIALIST ADMINISTRATION IN BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

Reverend J. Stitt Wilson was elected as mayor of this city in April, 1911. We give extracts from an informal account of his administration, published in the Los Angeles *Western Comrade*, September, 1913.

As a matter of fact, Berkeley has never had a "Socialist administration." There has been a Socialist mayor and one councilman

in a board of five. The anti-Socialist majority worked harmoniously with us on general municipal matters, but stood pat for capitalism each time we presented a genuine Socialist proposition.

Had we had one more man on the council, I believe Berkeley would have had by this time a municipal telephone, a municipal electric lighting plant, a municipal market, and it would be standing out as a beacon light on the subject of taxation of land values. And before now a whole advanced program would be laid out to supplement the municipal labor bureau which we did get through, a program by which men would be employed, vacant land put under cultivation, and value placed upon human beings, now the mere flotsam and jetsam in the labor market.

The general municipal policy was summed up in this sentence: *"I believe that the city administration should seek to secure the necessities and the advantages of city life, for the use and enjoyment of the humblest family, and to put these things into our hands at the lowest possible cost for the best possible service. . . . In the twentieth century we should never permit huge corporate monopolies to hold us at their mercy and charge us all the traffic will bear for the absolute necessities of life."* . . .

In this paragraph I can only make a list of the important municipal improvements which shall mark my administration in Berkeley. I copy the list from my annual report to the city council on vacating the office:

1. Municipal incinerator.
2. Municipal garage and ambulance.
3. Municipal laboratory.
4. Municipal employment bureau.
5. Perfection of the police flashlight system.
6. Additional fire department.
7. New heating apparatus.
8. Extensive street improvements.
9. Spotless town campaigns.
10. New corporation yards.
11. Passing sewer bonds.

Just a word about municipal finances. When I entered the city hall of Berkeley we had but \$12,000 surplus in the general fund. At the close of my first year we had a net balance of

\$27,000. When I took charge the total funds available from all sources were \$32,000, but I left for my successor \$60,000, besides \$50,000 in the treasury for the incinerator. . . .

Moreover, strange to say, I introduced an amendment to the city charter, providing that the tax rate might be raised to \$1.00 for purely municipal purposes, that is, an increase of 25 cents. I wrote and talked and worked for this increase, and the people carried it by a big majority. We did not raise the rate, but simply provided for a raise by charter amendment for future emergencies.

And when my day was done I had kept my vows, though having met reverses at the hands of the "system." . . .

6. SOCIALIST ADMINISTRATION IN BUTTE, MONTANA

Butte is the only American city in which a Socialist administration was not only elected in 1911 but re-elected in 1913. Mayor Duncan was later recalled as the result of a labor-union conflict. We quote again from an informal account of the administration written by Mayor Duncan himself and published in the *Kokomo Socialist* in November, 1913:

The success of the Socialist Party in Butte, the first time in 1911, was due to working-class solidarity, plus the votes of a disgusted and protesting bourgeoisie. . . .

It was different in 1913. This time we won on our merits. Again it was not wholly Socialist voters. We have not enough class-conscious workers to carry the city by straight Socialist votes. But it was by the votes of Socialists and other citizens who, having had two years of Socialist government, were resolved to have no other. So it was that this year the two old parties were forced into a frank fusion "to wipe out the blot of Socialist disgrace" and "to down the menace of Socialism." And so it was, also, that the Socialist candidates received a larger vote than two years before. . . .

We found a bankrupt city on our hands in 1911. Cities in Montana are constitutionally limited in the amount of indebtedness they may incur to three per cent of the assessed valuation of

taxable property. Butte's debt in 1911 was about half a million more than this limit would allow.

We attempted to increase the revenue by raising license rates on large business and especially by requiring mining companies to pay license. The old party aldermanic majority defeated this effort.

We succeeded, however, in forcing the old party aldermen to consent to raising the rate of taxation for city purposes from 12.1 mills to 16.2 mills. . . .

We repeated this in 1912, and again this year, and *now have the sinking fund where it should be*. The city will be able, in 1915, when the debt matures, to take up in full a \$400,000 bond issue ten years old and thus stop an annual interest drain of \$18,000. . . .

In the further effort to re-establish the credit of the city, we instituted several economies. We cut out every unnecessary salaried employee; reduced the police force to the minimum necessity; and cut out the graft that coal companies, contractors, etc., had enjoyed by hiring their idle teams to the city at \$3.50 per day. Instead of hiring, we purchased ten splendid teams outright, at a cost of between \$3,000 to \$4,000, and thus reduced the running expenses of our street department. *In less than seven months we had the city safely inside the legal limit of indebtedness; in four months' time, city warrants which had been discounted all the way from 20 to 30 per centum, passed at 95 per cent, and in eight months they were passing at par.*

By thus bringing general warrants of the city to par, we increased the amount of money wages actually received by every city employee. They can now get the face value of their warrants at any store in the city; whereas, under former administrations they could realize only 70 or 80 per cent of that value. . . .

While thus improving the municipal credit, we also adopted policies calculated to benefit the working-class in other ways. We started and are carrying out a well-planned program of municipal improvements. Without going into tiresome details, there have been more extensive public improvements and special improvements carried on by the Socialist administration during the three seasons since the spring of 1911 than have ever before been carried on in twice or three times that length of time in this city. . . .

Sanitary Policies

It is the record we have made in the matter of public health that we are proudest of. The city of Butte, in the spring of 1911, was one of the filthiest in the country. . . .

The Socialist administration attacked these conditions at once and have kept vigilantly on the job ever since. We began with a complete municipal cleaning up. Commencing on the outskirts in the working-class districts, the street and alley crews worked toward the center of the city, and in one month's time citizens were all remarking the great improvement. . . .

At the same time we began and have maintained strict, scientific and vigilant inspection of milk and meat and all other food products sold in the city. . . .

The results have been astounding. Butte is now one of the healthiest cities of its size in the United States. In the matter of deaths there has been a decided decrease from every disease except tuberculosis, which is very prevalent amongst the miners. From the diseases due to filth and unsanitary surroundings, the number of deaths is far below the average it used to be prior to the Socialist régime in this city. In the portion of the community outside our city limits and under the control of democratic city officers, the ratio of disease and deaths to population is just what it was two years ago. *Inside the city limits (excepting tuberculosis cases), the average death rate to population was 3 1-2 per cent lower from May, 1911, to May, 1913, than from May, 1909, to May, 1911, and the monthly average of cases of infectious and contagious diseases has fallen from 60 in 1900-10 and 73 in 1910-11, to 27 in 1911-12 and 36 in 1912-13; for the two-year term, 1909-11, 66.5, and for our term, 1911-13, 31.5 cases per month. . . .*

Up to last year, the fire laddies of Butte were on duty twenty-four hours, one day off each month, and ten days' vacation on pay each year. The Socialists introduced and succeeded in passing an ordinance to institute the two-platoon system, which requires the men to be on duty only twelve hours. . . .

Union Pickets Protected

Under former administrations, whenever trouble and disturbance arose on account of picketing "unfair" business houses by

organized labor, the police always arrested and the police magistrate would convict and fine the pickets. It was always the pickets who caused the disturbance, apparently. Under this administration, whenever picketing is to be done, organized labor notifies the mayor and plainclothes men are detailed to see that that picket is not assaulted. If trouble starts, the order is to arrest the aggressor. It has always been thugs in employ of the picketed merchant who have started trouble, and these have been arrested and fined. We have no more disturbances of this nature now. Union pickets are not molested. The same policy has been followed in case of street speaking. All speakers are protected, and every manifestation of a disposition to start a fight or disturbance is instantly quelled by the arrest of the provoker of the disturbance.

Red Light Policies

For many years there has been a restricted (red light) district in Butte. Under old party administrations, the keepers and women of this district were required to pay monthly tribute to the city. In addition to this, some of the police and detectives were accustomed to make easy money by blackmailing the women and taking graft for protection of criminals. . . . The Socialist administration put a stop to all this at once. We refused to derive any city revenue from this blood-money and dismissed policemen convicted of such grafting.

One of our first orders was to close every dance hall in the district, to suppress all music and brilliant lights to attract trade, to keep messenger boys out of the district, and to discontinue the electric messenger calls. At the same time, every wine room in the city was ordered to remove its closed booths, and every saloon forbidden to dispense intoxicants to women or minors. . . .

We have succeeded. The liquor traffic is driven out of the restricted district. . . .

7. SOCIALIST ADMINISTRATION IN SCHENECTADY, NEW YORK

The one Eastern city so far to have "gone Socialist" is Schenectady, New York, where George R. Lunn was elected mayor in the fall of 1911. We print salient ex-

tracts from his message of February, 1913, which sum up the accomplishments of the administration; and we give also the most important planks of the platform of 1913, when the city government failed of re-election. In 1915, however, Lunn was again elected mayor.

a. *Mayor Lunn's Message, February, 1913*

No single municipal or group of municipalities can inaugurate Socialism. . . . Not yet is this possible. What we can do, however, is to take advantage of the glorious opportunity open to the Socialists of Schenectady of demonstrating to the people of this city and country at large the spirit of Socialism and the application of Socialist principles so far as that is possible under the handicap of laws framed to establish and sustain the capitalist system. We can show that Socialism is a comprehensive movement which knits together the sporadic attempts of reformers, includes all that is really progressive in their proposals, but treats them in a constructive, orderly way on the basis of a general social philosophy, instead of in a haphazard manner on the basis of political log-rolling. . . .

This has been the spirit of the present administration. We recognize that our accomplishments have been decidedly limited by reason of handicaps and barriers purposely thrown in our way by those who regard private business as more important than community welfare.

As an illustration, the city sold ice at a cost greatly reduced below that charged by the private dealers. We were, however, restrained in this project by a court order, notwithstanding the fact that it was an endeavor in the interests of all our people and for their distinct benefit.

City's Operating Cost Reduced

The present administration began its term with a budget some \$37,000 larger than the budget of the year 1911, but the budget for 1912 included items for bond redemption and interest, amounting to \$60,000 above that for the same item in the budget of 1911, thereby making the 1912 budget actually less in the way of operating cost for the city's business. We were able to do

this by cutting expenses at every point possible in the interest of true economy. Superfluous positions were eliminated.

Laborers Given Another Wage Increase

Notwithstanding the increase which was made by the administration at the beginning of 1912, raising the pay of laborers from \$1.75 to \$2.00 per day, we have made still another advance, so that laborers hereafter shall receive \$2.25 per day.

No Political Favors Bestowed

We have not allowed our political power to influence us in awarding favors. We endeavor to treat every case squarely on its merits. As a matter of fact, no Socialist head of department or deputy has been increased. . . .

Milk Inspection Reorganized

. . . The department now requires the services of a milk inspector with special training in chemistry and bacteriology and a knowledge of their application to the producer as well as the dispenser. Careful inspections are regularly made of the dairies, as well as of the peddlers, and higher standards of milk purity demanded from the dairies. . . .

One of the innovations of this administration, called by our opponents one of our fads and fancies, was that of a *maternity and infancy nurse*, one of the most necessary positions in an up-to-date health department.

The new *department of chemistry* is another accessory to a better sanitation. . . . We have also established in the last year a *dental clinic*. . . .

Another accomplishment in the health department has been the establishment of a *free municipal dispensary*. . . .

Within the charities department excellent work has been accomplished by establishing a *municipal store* where the needy poor of the city have received provisions instead of money. . . .

In this department a *municipal lodging house* has been established and fully equipped and is now being efficiently operated.

In order to co-ordinate the existing agencies and to provide

machinery for carrying out the larger purposes of a twentieth-century city, we have created a new city department known as the *board of public welfare*.

.

Public Works Makes Splendid Showing

In the department of public works a splendid showing has been made. The streets have been cleaned better and at less expense than in previous years. The streets were in a deplorable condition when the present administration took office, no cleaning whatever having been done from November 7, 1911 (election night) until January 1, 1912. The pavement repairs have been made at a much less cost. The asphalt patching under the previous Democratic administration, cost the city \$2.16 a square yard. Under the present Socialist administration the cost has been \$1.16 per square yard, the same firm, the Schenectady Contracting Company, doing the work. This one item has saved the city \$10,265.

.

Garbage Disposal Plant At Last

I am glad to report that the plans for a garbage disposal plant are well under way and that the city will possess one of the most up-to-date plants before the end of the present year. We have arranged in the budget for the collection of garbage and ashes at the city's expense.

.

We look back upon a year of hard work on the part of all connected with the city government, but we also know that there has been definite accomplishment in the way of efficient administration.

b. Municipal Platform of the Schenectady Socialist Party, 1913

The Socialist Party of the city of Schenectady reaffirms its adherence to the principles of Socialism as set forth in the national platform of the Socialist Party. We realize that to elect our candidates in this municipal election would not bring

Socialism; but we also realize that all hope of improving local conditions for the mass of the people depends on the application of Socialist principles and methods to municipal affairs, and it is to this end that the Socialist Party and its candidates are pledged.

Municipal Ownership

We declare for municipal ownership and democratic management of all municipal utilities which are now privately owned, such as the electric light, power and public transportation system, gas, ice and cold storage plants, slaughter-houses, and coal yards, to the end that the cost of the service be reduced, the wages of the employees increased, the hours of labor shortened, and the service improved. Pending the time when municipal ownership is possible, we favor granting franchises only on condition that the city be adequately compensated.

Home Rule

We demand the enactment of such amendments to the state constitution as will allow cities the power to frame their own charters, establish municipal ownership of public utilities and conduct city business without interference from the state legislature.

Initiative and Referendum

Pending the time when the great principle of the initiative and referendum shall be established by the state law, we pledge ourselves for another two years to work out some plan whereby every citizen of the city shall be able to express his or her wish on every important question of public welfare, and such majority expression shall be mandatory upon our elected public officials. Also some plan whereby a given number of citizens may bring before the administration officials matters which they believe to be of importance.

Public Work

We pledge ourselves to the further extension of direct employment of labor used on public work and to continue the purchase of such equipment as will enable the city to do all its own grading, paving, and repairing of streets, laying of water and

sewer mains, and erection of public buildings, so that the extravagant and unsatisfactory contract system may be abolished.

We further pledge ourselves to continue our policy of increasing the efficiency of this department, and of raising the standard of the employees by establishing a rate of wages consistent with the high cost of living.

We declare in favor of the employment of organized labor on all public work, and pledge ourselves to give legal preference to fair employers.

Education

. . . We pledge ourselves to extend the free text-books and supplies to the high school; and to open the buildings to civic clubs and as social centers. In order to increase teaching efficiency we pledge ourselves to extend the system of free lunches, reduce the size of classes, and again increase the teachers' salaries.

Parks, Playgrounds, and Recreation

We pledge ourselves to liberal continuation of our park and playground policy, so that there shall be a playground at every school with a minimum of 40 square feet for each child, and at least a small park within a half mile of every home in the city. We propose more indoor and outdoor public concerts and lectures, and in addition municipal dances, moving pictures, and other popular entertainments.

Police Power

. . . We believe that the police power of the city should be utilized to the advantage of the great mass of the people, and during industrial strife should never be exercised to encourage strike-breakers and thugs.

We pledge ourselves to continue the policy of fair treatment and public trial that we have accorded members of the fire and police departments.

Public Health

. . . We will maintain and extend the municipal laboratory for testing milk and other foods and drugs; the municipal milk station and maternity nursing; the municipal dental dispensary;

improved food, tenement, sanitary and milk inspection; free anti-toxins; and, if necessary, additional physicians and medicines, school medical examiners and nurses.

We declare that in addition to the shower baths and swimming pools which we have established in the new schools the city should have a municipal bathhouse.

Taxation

. . . To provide the necessary revenues for such new public functions as parks, playgrounds, garbage collection, gymnasiums, nurses, food and health protection, we declare for enforcement of the general and personal tax laws equally upon all, for gradual elimination of taxes on improvements, and such *taxation of land values* as will gradually appropriate to the public service the increment arising from growth of population and public improvements.

.

8. SOCIALIST ADMINISTRATION IN MILWAUKEE, WISCONSIN

As the largest American city that has ever come under Socialist control, Milwaukee still remains the type of the Socialist municipality in this country. In this city Emil Seidel was elected mayor in April, 1910, supported by an administration almost completely Socialist. In 1912 they were driven out by a coalition of the old parties, and though the Socialists are still represented in the city government, they have never so far regained their power.

Leaving details for a later page, we print here from Mayor Seidel's first message only enough to show the spirit of the administration and its attitude toward labor.

a. From Mayor Seidel's Message, April, 1910

. . . I cannot too strongly impress upon you the sacredness of the trust placed upon you. All your efforts must be bent towards the execution of the task before you. Many obstacles will be placed in your way. Disappointments and heartaches will not

be spared you. Your successes may very often not follow your first attempts. But resolute pluck and determined perseverance must in the end conquer the difficulties that face you.

. . . At all times the heads of the various city departments should be vigilant, and every worker should understand that in doing his work to the utmost of his ability he is contributing to the efficiency of the city government. . . .

Labor

The workers of our city are its most valuable asset. Your attention should be directed to the passage of such measures as will promote the well-being of this class of citizens, safeguard health, check any tendency to encroach upon such few rights as the workers still enjoy, and wherever possible extend for them the opportunity of life.

In this direction a number of steps can be taken. The administration should constantly watch over the conditions prevailing in factories, workshops, and places of employment, with regard to sanitation. There should at all times be a full and hearty co-operation with state factory inspectors in the enforcement of measures providing for industrial hygiene.

Therefore, in contracts to be let by the city, the specifications should provide for hours of labor that are not exhausting, that leave a margin of time for rest and development. Such specifications should also provide for sufficiency of light and ventilation; they should prohibit child labor and properly protect woman labor, and prevent the imposition upon workers of degrading conditions.

The city has police powers enabling it to enforce the ordinance which makes the carrying of concealed weapons unlawful. This ordinance should be strictly enforced. Our population is law-abiding and well able to handle its own affairs. The practice of *bringing armed hirelings into the city of Milwaukee* to mingle with a population that is peace-loving, has cost loss of life and should be stopped. Our difficulties should be settled by appeals to reason. . . . (*Italics ours.*)

b. *The Municipal Platform of Milwaukee*

Instead of printing verbatim the Milwaukee Platform of 1910, we give the comparison of this platform, plank by plank, with the actual achievements of the administration during two years. The comparison is taken from the Municipal Campaign Book of 1912.

The Platform

1. We demand—new charter, complete home rule, initiative, referendum, recall.

2. Ownership and operation of public service enterprises as far and as fast as state laws will permit.

3. Equitable taxation—big corporations to pay their rightful share.

The Record

1. Forty different bills sent to the legislature, which were calculated to secure some measure of home rule; proposed amendment to the constitution introduced, also general home rule bill; a number of charter amendments adopted as result of strenuous fight of Social Democrats, among them one providing for initiative and referendum.

2. First unit of the electric lighting plant under construction at garbage plant. Contracts for the machinery for main plant let. Budget for 1912 includes issue of \$100,000 in bonds and \$300,000 worth of mortgage certificates for completion of plant.

3. Tax commissioner's office held by a Dave Ross Democratic hold-over politician, Frank B. Schutz. Social Democrats did not secure control of this department until January 1, 1912. Efforts made to secure tax experts—blocked by

4. Slaughter-house and municipal markets.

5. Direct employment—abolition of contract system.

6. Firemen and policemen to have fair treatment and public trial before being discharged.

7. The city shall pay fair wages, not less than union scale.

8. Election day public holiday.

9. City shall provide for its unemployed.

Republicans and Democrats in state legislature. Readjustment of basis of taxation to true or full value as required by law. Millions of dollars' worth of property discovered by Social Democrats subject to taxation, but omitted from the roll by Democratic tax department.

4. Bills covering these points introduced at the last session of legislature. Killed by old parties. Commission appointed and at work on plans.

5. Public works department submitted carefully prepared plans involving the purchase of materials and machinery in order that city might do its own paving. Three-fourths vote necessary to carry the proposition; minority defeated the plan. A beginning made in the asphalt repair department.

6. Law secured and put into operation.

7. Minimum wage established and union scale for all city employees.

8. Law enacted for half-holiday on election day.

9. Co-operation of the administration with Federated Trades Council, Associated Charities, Merchants and Manufacturers' Association to relieve unemployed. Assisted in the establishment of a free em-

10. Municipal stone quarry.
11. Municipal wood and coal yard.
12. Municipal ice plant.
13. Annexation of territory.
14. City planning for better housing.
15. Redistricting of city wards.
16. Municipal terminal.
17. Extension of free medical service.
18. For personal liberty and against vice.
19. Comfort stations.
20. Municipal plumbing and sewerage.

ployment bureau now developed into an organization covering the entire state. Most effective of its kind in America.

10. Resolution for the purchase of the Zimmerman site passed council. Provision in budget.

11. Awaiting proper public control of transportation and actual resources.

12. Constitutionality of law giving city right to establish being tested in the courts.

13. Several portions annexed.

14. Metropolitan Park Commission, now called the City Planning Commission, at work on plan. Also land commission appointed.

15. Accomplished.

16. Defeated by referendum.

17. New isolation hospital established; Blue Mound Sanitarium taken over by the county; tuberculosis commission co-ordinating forces for help in fight on that dread disease; child welfare work established.

18. Many disreputable saloons put out of business.

19. The first comfort station erected and in operation at First Avenue Viaduct.

20. Enabling law defeated by the legislature.

21. Reorganization of the sewerage system.

22. Small parks and playgrounds.

23. Larger development and use of public schools favored—free text-books—social centers.

24. Public recreations and amusements.

21. Report of sewerage commission received and plans being made for consolidation of the water department and sewerage department to enable the carrying out of recommendations.

22. Fifth Ward Park and playground on south side. City forester engaged.

23. Larger appropriations for public schools made by Social Democrats than ever before. County board sets aside \$5,000 to be used for the feeding of under-nursed school children. Twenty-one school buildings opened for social, civic, and neighborhood clubs.

24. Concerts given in auditorium Sunday afternoons during the winter months. Park concerts extended.

VII. SIDNEY WEBB ON MUNICIPAL TAXATION *

Mr. Webb here dwells on the folly of the low taxation fetish:

Taxes

We must bear in mind that although we want to facilitate additional expenditure, and perhaps—just by way of greasing the wheels—to effect a small reduction in the hardest cases, we ought not to try generally to reduce the local rates to any great extent. Whatever may be the truth as to the real incidence of rates, nothing is more certain than that any great reduction benefits the landlord, and the landlord almost exclusively. Reduce

* From Fabian Tract No. 172, "What about the Rates," by Sidney Webb.

the rates in Ancoats by twenty-five per cent and the laborer in the Ancoats slum will pay not a farthing less for the weekly rent of his wretched hovel—the slum owner will get the whole benefit of the reduction. Reduce the rates on agricultural land, as the Conservatives and Tariff Reformers are always proposing—does anyone suppose that the agricultural laborer will pay less for his cottage, or get a rise of wages? Reduce the rates in the coal-mining districts, so that the colliery companies have to pay less on the miners’ cottages—is there any reason to suppose that the miner will be charged a lower rent, or that he will get a higher price per ton for hewing? A reduction of rates may help the peasant proprietor or the man who owns a freehold house. But so long as we are nearly all in the position of having to pay rent to a private landlord or house owner—especially where, as is the case with regard to more than half the population (and the poorest half), the rent is collected weekly—to expect that the wage-earner will benefit by reducing the charge made on the owner is like looking to get butter out of a dog’s mouth. . . .

The Real Profit of Municipal Enterprise

Thus, my final conclusion is that we must meet the ratepayer face to face and educate him on the question. Courage and clear thinking, and some capacity for popular explanation, must remain a necessary part of the equipment of the elected councilor. The ratepayer, after all, gets far more in return for his rates than he does for any other part of his expenditure. If you won’t pay an adequate education rate, you will have to pay a higher poor rate and police rate. If you won’t pay a proper public health rate, you will certainly pay tenfold in sickness rate and death rate. Mr. Chamberlain successfully fought his municipal battles at Birmingham forty years ago on the war-cry of “Higher rates and a healthy city.” Can anyone doubt that this policy has been proved to “pay” at Birmingham; to pay even the Birmingham ratepayer and the Birmingham property owner? What city is going to own that it is less enlightened than Birmingham?

CHAPTER XVII

CO-OPERATION

THE co-operative control of industry by groups of producers or consumers is often proposed as a possible *alternative* to Socialism. That this is not the Socialist view is shown by the fact that Socialists indorse this movement wherever it seems to be practicable. They have greatly aided it in Great Britain and have been its chief promoters in Belgium. In the United States, however, modern industry reached its present highly organized condition, including the great department stores and other large retail stores, before co-operation was inaugurated on any large scale. As a consequence, many American Socialists doubt the practical importance of the co-operative movement in this country—as the discussion at the American Congress of 1913 (from which we quote) demonstrates.

I. RESOLUTION OF INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF COPENHAGEN, 1910

The International Congress of Copenhagen (1910) adopted the following resolution on co-operative societies:

Taking into consideration that distributive co-operative societies are not only able to secure for their members immediate material advantages, but are also capable of first increasing the influence of the proletariat by the elimination of private commercial enterprise, and, secondly, by bettering the condition of the working-classes by means of productive services organized by themselves and by educating the workers in the independent dem-

ocratic management of social means of exchange and production;

Considering also that co-operation alone is incapable of realizing the aim of Socialism, which is the acquisition of political power for the purpose of collective ownership of the means of production;

This Congress declares, while warning the working-classes against the theory which maintains that co-operation is in itself sufficient, that the working-class has the strongest interest in utilizing the weapon of co-operation in the class struggle and urges all Socialists and all members of trade-unions to take part in the co-operative movement, in order to develop themselves in the spirit of Socialism and keep the co-operative societies from any deviation from the path of education and the promotion of working-class solidarity.

The Socialist members of co-operative societies are urged to endeavor in these societies to see that the profits are not entirely returned to the members, but that part is devoted, either by the society itself or by the federation of wholesale societies, to the development of production and to education and instruction, in order:

1. That the conditions of wages and work in the co-operative societies shall be regulated in accordance with trade-union rules.
2. That the organization of the conditions of employment in co-operative societies shall be the best possible, and that no purchases of goods shall be made without regard to the condition of the producers.

It is left to the co-operative organizations of each country to decide for themselves whether and to what extent they will aid from their resources the political and trade-union movement.

Furthermore, being convinced that the services which co-operation can render to the working-class will be the greater in proportion as the co-operative movement is itself strong and united, the Congress declares that it is desirable that the co-operative societies of each country which is constituted on this basis and subscribes to this present resolution should form a single federation.

It declares, besides, that the working-class in its struggle against capitalism is especially concerned that trade-unions, co-operative societies, and the Socialist Party, while preserving each its own unity and autonomy, should enter into relations more and more intimate with one another.

II. THE AMERICAN SOCIALIST CONVENTION OF 1912

The following reports and discussion show an attitude among American Socialists toward co-operatives that is friendly, though not enthusiastic.

1. THE MAJORITY REPORT ADOPTED BY THE CONVENTION

Just as the labor unions fight for industrial self-control for the working-class, the Socialist Party for political self-control, and the labor and Socialist press for intellectual self-control for the workers, so the co-operative movement fights for an increasing degree of economic self-control for the workers through the ownership and use of industrial and commercial capital by organized groups of the workers.

The development and successful operation of the co-operative movement in connection with the international labor movement is an historical fact, which cannot be disputed. While in some countries it may seem for the time being to have checked other lines of working-class activity, it seems to be true also that "the economic power of a class at a given stage of development turns into political power."

The value of the co-operative movement to the working-class has been recognized by the Socialist Party, though reluctantly at first. It was recently so recognized at the Copenhagen Congress in 1910, the American delegates voting for the resolution.

Following the path of other national organizations of the Socialist Party, the Socialist Party of America must recognize the fact of the existence on the American continent of a successful co-operative movement, though it has not as yet been brought into any unified form.

Your committee has not been able to gather any adequate data, but is informed, from the personal knowledge of those who came before the committee, of distributive co-operatives doing a total business of not less than twenty million dollars a year, in only a few of the states of the Union. Nearly one thousand local organizations are within the knowledge of those reporting these facts to your committee, which are operating successfully.

That there is still room within the developing processes of the

capitalist system in this country for the inauguration and building up of a strong and successful co-operative movement is evident from the facts already adduced, especially in view of other and as yet unverified statements which are nevertheless largely of common knowledge.

The benefits claimed by those most closely connected with the international co-operative movement are threefold, and relate to:

1. The furnishing of an improved quality of food and other supplies to the co-operators;

2. The actual increase of the economic resources of the co-operators, through the control of their own purchasing power, and the building up of reserve funds which have been of great service to the industrial and political arms of the labor movement;

3. The training of members of the working-class in the processes of industrial and commercial administrative work, and developing this new capacity among them, thus proving that it is possible not only to do without the capitalist's capital but also to do without his alleged superior intelligence.

The most successful co-operatives in America seem to be among the groups of foreign-speaking workers of the same nationality, who furnish a community highly homogeneous, having similar habits and customs of life; and among the farmers, who find it possible to combine at once their buying and selling powers in the same organization.

In view of the failures which have occurred in this and other countries in connection with the efforts to establish co-operatives, we recommend that a committee of five persons be elected by this Convention, not confined to delegates in the Convention, who shall be given the assistance of the national office in making an investigation into the facts concerning the co-operative movement; the committee to make a special effort to ascertain what bearing the degree of industrial development and organization in any particular locality has upon the operation of co-operation in that locality; to make tentative reports from time to time through the national office and the party press; and to make a final report at the next national convention.

CHAPTER XVIII

THE DRINK QUESTION

SOCIALISTS sympathize with the attack on the liquor interests, since they sympathize with every attack on the interests and every assault on political corruption. They also desire to see the working-people keep in the maximum state of physical and mental efficiency. On the other hand, Socialists have always been ardent advocates of personal liberty in every form. The Socialist attitude to this question is further complicated by the fact that a large number of working-people are engaged in the manufacture of alcoholic beverages and would have to accept lower salaries at other employments if they lost these positions. The labor unions representing these employments are therefore opposed to all radically restrictive measures.

There can be little question that the majority of Socialist parties demand either the nationalization of the drink traffic or a very rigid governmental control. Moreover, the question has been generally recognized by Socialists as of growing importance, and was to have been acted on by the proposed Congress of Vienna which was to have been held in 1914. The report to this Congress (which we reproduce) would probably have been adopted, though the Congress would have been very evenly divided on the subject. The general Socialist position is further illustrated by the discussion at the French Congress in instructing its delegates to the proposed International Congress at Vienna.

The American Party, on the other hand, although it is almost evenly divided on the subject, has taken a position

which seems directed against the Prohibition movement, and yet it proposes no alternative remedy for the situation except the very general one of Socialism. Of course Socialism may also be offered as the Socialist remedy to all the other problems with which we have been concerned in preceding chapters. But the Socialist parties have favored special remedies for all these special problems, and there is every reason to suppose, as Vandervelde's report suggests, that in all the leading countries they will soon endorse special remedies for the drink evil, and that in most countries it will be along the lines of this report and the resolution of the French Congress—though the influence of the wage-earners engaged in the manufacture of alcoholic beverages prevents the reaching of a well-defined international decision at the present time.

I. REPORT TO THE PROPOSED INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF VIENNA, 1914

The report to the proposed International Congress to be held at Vienna (1914) on this question, drawn up by Vandervelde, presents the following conclusions:

(1) Alcohol, ethylic alcohol, is a poison, like morphine or arsenic.

(2) Apart from cases where it can be prescribed medically, it would not be a question of distinguishing between its use and abuse: to take a little is to take a little of what is bad; to take much is to do injury to oneself.

(3) All drinks containing alcohol—wine, beer, cider—are more or less harmful. Their degree of harmfulness depends upon their alcoholic strength. Beers like lambic, stout, uitzet, contain from six to nine per cent of alcohol; wines from ten to twenty per cent. In many countries alcoholization by wines or beers causes more disasters than alcoholization by spirits.

(4) It is not true to say that, under the capitalist system, with

its bad conditions of work and existence, the workers must inevitably consume alcohol. It is the poorest, on the contrary, who will have the strongest interest against the consumption of dear drinks, containing next to nothing of nutritive element, but, on the contrary, a dangerous poison.

(5) It is true that the workers, badly fed, badly housed, badly treated from every point of view, are more inclined than others to seek forgetfulness of their sufferings and anxieties in alcoholic narcotics. Consequently improvement in the conditions of existence for the proletariat is one of the most efficacious means of fighting against alcoholism.

(6) By the side of this indirect action comes direct action, and experience shows that this direct action gives serious and lasting results, if it is led by men who preach by example, men who are for the propaganda of deed, and who, without wanting an excessive austerity for others, abstain totally and strictly themselves from all drinks containing alcohol, whether in wine, beer, or other fermented liquor.

(7) We are personally inclined to believe that the form of organization most suitable for the conduct of such direct action is that of the Independent Order of Good Templars, which, being politically neutral, leaves the most complete political liberty to its lodges. At this moment several among them are affiliated to the Socialist Party.

(8) The Socialist Good Templars, and other groups of Socialist teetotalers, independently of their general action against alcoholism, should assign to themselves a special mission for organizing the propaganda inside the party itself, to act particularly upon young militants, to convince their comrades of this fact, that the depressing and paralyzing action of alcohol reduces the fighting energy of the proletariat, and where it reaches a certain degree it renders it incapable of all patient and sustained effort. We say nothing about the resources which money spent on alcohol takes away from the political and economic organization of the workers.

Referring to these conclusions, the report states:

The International Congress is not asked to pronounce for these theses by the vote of its majority. We recognize readily that many among them lend themselves to controversy. If men of

science are agreed in recognizing that large doses of alcohol constitute a dangerous poison, they are not unanimous in admitting, with Kraepelin, Smith, Forel, Laitinen, that even a moderate consumption of wine or beer is not only useless, but harmful. The decision on that point must rest with further experimental researches, and not with a vote of the Congress. But what we can ask, what we have the right to ask of the Socialist and Labor International, is to pronounce distinctly in favor of direct action against alcoholism, and to examine the best means of rendering such action effective.

The report describes the efforts made in Belgium, "where it is not water but beer which constitutes the fourth element," and the difficulties of establishing lodges of Socialist Good Templars, and the conclusion is that "much more satisfactory results will be obtained from the propaganda of abstinence than by moderation."

The report continues:

We shall certainly not make ourselves ridiculous by pretending that a little beer or wine can appreciably hurt those who consume it, even daily. In the course of our existence as Socialists we undoubtedly do many things infinitely more prejudicial to our health—if only in passing interminable evenings in the midst of a thick smoke, in the poisoned atmosphere of meeting-places.

To speak frankly, we do not see, from the individual point of view, a striking difference between the very moderate use of beer or wine and complete abstention from alcoholic drinks.

If, therefore, we recommend total abstinence, it is less in the interest of those who abstain than of those who abuse—less from the object of individual hygiene than from social propaganda.

It will not do, indeed, that the workers whom we counsel not to drink alcohol in the form of brandy should be able to say that it is only too easy to give them such advice, when we ourselves do not abstain from alcohol in the form of beer, burgundy, or champagne.

We know well—the editorial staff of the *Vorwaerts* recalls it slightly—that for many of our comrades it is a sacrifice to tie

themselves down, after a long day's work, not to drink anything other than tea, seltzer-water, or lemonade.

But what is this trifling sacrifice in comparison with the undeniable advantages of a propaganda of deed which is thus able to strike their imaginations?

Moreover, the "moderate drinker" who completely gives up alcohol finds a personal advantage from a few months, even a few weeks, of abstinence. No one will deny, indeed, that alcohol, no matter how small the doses, and even when inoffensive to manual workers, exercises a noxious influence, a paralyzing action on the cerebral centers and on intellectual work.

Vandervelde had placed the following resolution on the agenda of the Congress, and it is probable that it would have been carried:

Granting the immense evil which alcohol inflicts on the working-class by the ruination of its physical and moral health, the weakening of its combative energy, and the absorption each year of sums equal at least to those which are raised by the war budget:

The Congress considers that, even in the interest of the progress of the Labor and Socialist movement, it is absolutely necessary that the affiliated parties should organize direct action against alcoholism, thus acting entirely in the interests of the working-class:

(1) By urging the militants, and particularly the Labor and Socialist journals, to call the attention of the workers to the danger of alcoholism more than has been done in the past;

(2) By trying to obtain the suppression of all traffic in strong drinks, or at least of spirits, on premises under the control of the affiliated organizations and parties;

(3) By promoting the establishment of groups, whose special mission shall be to organize propaganda against alcoholism in working-class centers;

(4) By encouraging the militants and groups which are against alcohol to undertake a most energetic propaganda of deed by themselves practicing abstinence from alcoholic drinks;

(5) *By attacking alcohol in all its capitalist forms on legislative ground.*

The measures to be taken for this [last-mentioned] purpose,

from the limitation of the number of licenses to complete prohibition, will naturally vary in different countries, and will depend on the results already obtained by teetotal propaganda. But everywhere the Labor and Socialist parties must put themselves in the front rank of those who wish the workers to be freed from the domination of the producers and retailers of alcohol. (Our italics.)

II. THE FRENCH CONGRESS OF 1914

There was a strong difference of opinion at the Congress. As the anti-alcohol faction won in France, where the wine industry is so much more important than either the beer industry in Germany or distilleries in other countries, there can be little doubt that the cause of anti-alcoholism would also have received strong support at the International Congress of 1914—had it been held. For in Europe, as in America, it is only the brewery workmen and others in parallel industries who prevent the workingmen taking a progressive position on this great question.

The two remedies offered at the French Congress were *nationalization of the drink traffic* and the *limitation of the number of drinking places*. Nearly all speakers favored the former measure. But the friends of alcohol thought it sufficient, while its opponents wanted it supplemented and preceded by the second measure, as being easier of accomplishment.

We take the following account from *Le Peuple*, the Belgian Socialist daily:

“It is known that certain Socialistic deputies [in France] voted against the bill limiting the number of wine-shops. This is the course of reasoning of the theoretical opponents—narrow enough, in our opinion: ‘All measures recommended against alcoholism miss their end. The triumph of Socialism is the sole solution!’

“Lafont, who, as mayor of Firminy, adopted a policy

of control and restriction over the wine-shops, replied to these arguments. He admitted, as do all important Socialists, that the causes for the greater part of the evil that afflict the working-class have their origin in the capitalistic régime itself. However, he insists that no one should neglect any possible means, however slight, of assisting the workers to control and to educate themselves. His plea against the dangerous multiplication of drinking-places received the approval of the Congress. In the vote taken, those for limiting the number of liquor shops were 1,518; opposed, 1,192; not voting, 202.

"The French delegates were instructed then to move a similar resolution in the International Congress."

III. THE AMERICAN CONVENTION OF 1912

The following resolution was adopted:

The manufacture and sale for profit of intoxicating and adulterated liquors leads directly to many serious social evils. Intemperance in the use of alcoholic liquors weakens the physical, mental, and moral powers.

We hold, therefore, that *any excessive indulgence in intoxicating liquors by members of the working-class is a serious obstacle to the triumph of our class* since it impairs the vigor of the fighters in the political and economic struggle, and we urge the members of the working-class to avoid any indulgence which might impair their ability to wage a successful political and economic struggle, and so hinder the progress of the movement for their emancipation.

We do not believe that the evils of alcoholism can be eradicated by repressive measures or any extension of the police powers of the capitalist state—alcoholism is a disease of which capitalism is the chief cause. Poverty, overwork, and overworry necessarily result in intemperance on the part of the victims. To abolish the wage system with all its evils is the surest way to eliminate the evils of alcoholism and the traffic in intoxicating liquor. (Our italics.)

In 1914 an investigation of the liquor traffic, in view of the present prohibition agitation, was ordered by the National Committee—after a bitter discussion, in which the Committee showed itself to be very evenly divided on the question.

CHAPTER XIX

WOMAN SUFFRAGE

WOMAN suffrage has always been advocated by Socialists, and in some countries they have been its first supporters. Seldom, however, has any party gone to the extent of the British Labor Party Conference in 1913, where it declared that it would not accept any extension of manhood suffrage unless woman suffrage was granted at the same time. That the Labor Party (and so also the cause of woman suffrage for which it stands) would be greatly strengthened by the extension of manhood suffrage seems evident, since a large proportion of its members are at present disfranchised.

The American Socialist Party has always been very active in support of woman suffrage, though at the time of the Wisconsin referendum this measure was badly defeated in the strongest Socialist wards in Milwaukee, indicating that the Socialist voters, and perhaps the party members also, are by no means unanimous on the question. It may also be of interest to note in this connection that one of the few sections in New York State which, in 1915, gave a majority of votes to the suffrage cause was Schenectady, the city which returned Dr. Geo. R. Lunn, Socialist, to the mayoralty chair. Such opposition as has been publicly voiced has been based on the probability that many of the Catholic women would follow the Catholic Church in its hostility to the Socialist Party. This argument is not considered as a sound one by the overwhelming majority of the American Socialists, who believe that

these women would soon become enlightened in regard to that which is advantageous both to themselves and to the country. There was also a well-grounded fear on the part of many employees engaged in the making and distributing of alcoholic beverages that the women would put a large part of them out of employment.

I. THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF STUTTGART, 1907

The International Socialist Congress resolved as follows:

The Congress greets with the utmost pleasure the First International Socialist Women's Conference, and expresses its entire solidarity with the demands concerning woman suffrage, put forward by it. The Congress, in particular, declares:

It is the duty of Socialist parties of all countries to agitate most energetically for the introduction of universal womanhood suffrage. The Socialist Party repudiates limited woman suffrage as an adulteration of and a caricature upon the principle of political equality of the female sex. It fights for the sole living concrete expression of this principle, namely, universal womanhood suffrage, which should belong to all women of age and not be conditioned by property, taxation, education, or any other qualification which would exclude members of the laboring classes from the enjoyment of this right. The Socialist women shall not carry on this struggle for complete equality of right to vote in alliance with the middle-class women suffragists, but in common with the Socialist parties, which insist upon woman suffrage as one of the fundamental and most important reforms for the full democratization of political franchise in general.

It is the duty of all Socialist parties of all countries to agitate strenuously for the introduction of universal womanhood suffrage. Hence, the agitation for the democratization of the franchise to the legislative and administrative bodies, both national and local, must also embrace woman suffrage and must insist upon it, whether it be carried on in Parliament or elsewhere. In those countries where the democratization of manhood suffrage has already gone sufficiently far, or is completely realized, the Socialist

parties must raise a campaign in favor of universal womanhood suffrage, and in connection with it put, of course, forward all those demands which we have yet to realize in the interest of the full civil rights of the male portion of the proletariat.

Although the International Socialist Congress cannot dictate to any country a particular time at which a suffrage campaign should be commenced, it, nevertheless, declares that when such a campaign is instituted in any country, it should proceed on the general Social Democratic lines of universal adult suffrage without distinction and nothing less.

The Congress thus condemned the limited or "lady" suffrage bill advocated by many British suffragists, including some Socialists.

II. THE CONFERENCE OF THE BRITISH LABOR PARTY, 1913

Mr. H. J. Rolf [East Ham L. R. C.] moved the following composite resolution:

"That this Conference re-affirms its previous decisions regarding the enfranchisement of women, deplors the position created by the ruling of the speaker, considers that the pledge of the prime minister can only be adequately and safely redeemed by the Government providing facilities during the coming session for a free vote of the House of Commons on a woman's measure, and should it obtain a second reading the Government becoming responsible for it through all its subsequent stages.

"It calls upon the Parliamentary Party to do all in its power to expedite the passage of a bill during the coming session, giving votes to women on a broad and democratic basis."

Mr. H. Dubery [I. L. P.] moved the following amendment:

“To add: It further calls upon the party in Parliament to oppose any franchise bill in which women are not included.”

Mr. Dubery declared that the first step was to bring in a franchise bill for women; that it was the women who had made that demand, and they who would reap the reward. He appealed to the Conference to have the Parliamentary Party refuse in the future to deal with men's suffrage bills, but to make women the first point of all.

Mr. W. Thorne, M. P. [Gasworkers] declared that he did not care what the Conference decided, but that they should decide definitely on some course of action.

W. S. Sanders [Fabian Society] stated that the cause of woman suffrage had been sold, and that it was the business of Parliament or the Government to make good the promise that had not been kept. There was only one way to do that and that was to say that so serious did they think this conscious or unconscious breaking of the pledge to women, they must put that question first and foremost in any matter referring to the alteration of the franchise. The Liberals had refused to do that and the Conservatives would not do it. Both parties were divided. The one party which had kept any respect for politics in the hearts and minds of the women was the Labor Party. If the Labor Party failed the women, no longer could any of the women engaged in politics be expected to believe that their claims were being considered seriously. The women members of the Fabian Society appealed to the Labor Party to keep its record of sincerity and chivalry, and say to the other parties: You are not prepared to keep your word; we are prepared to go one better than our word. Instead of saying that a bill without women would not be acceptable, the party should say that a bill that did not

confer the franchise on women would be opposed. If the party did that they would not only revive the dying belief of women in the sincerity of politics, but they would bring to the support of the party that great new element which he believed would do much to secure for the country what the Labor Party was working for.

Mr. Stephen Walsh, M. P. [Miners' Federation], said that no delegate could have listened to the speeches that had been delivered without feeling the greatest possible respect for the point of view taken up, but he wanted the Conference to consider for one moment the position of the members of Parliament who owed allegiance to the party and who had been sent to Parliament on the pledges they had given to their constituents in accordance with authority derived from the Conference. What was the position? For six years the Conference, year after year, had decided in favor of adult suffrage. He placed adult suffrage in his program in 1906 and in every election address since. He was prepared to fight as strongly as he could for the inclusion of women on broad and democratic lines and for the inclusion of men also; but his association and his constituents had also a right to say that they expected him to play the game. . . . He would do all that lay in his power along with his colleagues in the party to get women the franchise on the broadest possible lines. . . . But to say that if they did not succeed in so doing they should therefore refuse a bill that offered manifold advantages in other directions was to ask them to submit to a strain which hitherto they had never had imposed upon them. . . .

Mr. Philip Snowden, M. P. [I. L. P.], said that Mr. Walsh's speech was surely the most extraordinary deliverance ever made to a labor conference. His remarks were usually distinguished by being logical, but that quality had entirely deserted him on this occasion. The question

“What does Mr. Walsh mean by adult suffrage?” was a pertinent one, but the only inference from Mr. Walsh’s remarks was that according to him adult suffrage meant manhood suffrage. More than fifty years ago the House of Lords declared that in all matters affecting the franchise “person” meant “man,” and “women” were not “persons” in the eyes of the law. What did this resolution ask the Conference to do? It began by asking the Conference to reaffirm its former declarations. What were they? According to Mr. Walsh, for six years the Conference had advocated adult suffrage, and he [the speaker] thought that he interpreted that aright when he said adult suffrage meant men and women. Mr. Walsh asked: What did the Conference declare last year? It declared that no measure for the extension of the franchise would be acceptable to the Labor Party unless it included women. What was the present situation? Up to the previous week the women had been led to believe that if the House of Commons gave a vote in favor of the enfranchisement of women that the enfranchisement of women would become a Government measure, and every member of the Government was going to be pledged to support the bill in all its stages. Mr. Asquith stated himself in the House of Commons on Monday afternoon that anti-suffrage members of the Government would be free in all the stages of the private Member’s Woman Suffrage Bill, not only to vote against it, but to use their position to the utmost limit. The Government had withdrawn from Mr. Asquith’s pledge, and the women were in an infinitely worse position than before. There was no man with five minutes’ experience of the House of Commons who believed for a single moment that there was a ghost of a chance of 6,000,000 or 8,000,000 women being enfranchised by a private Member’s Bill. Would the delegates have been satisfied when

they made a demand for the repeal of the Taff Vale decision, if they had been asked to rely upon a private Member's Bill? This was a question as important in the interests of the community and of the Labor section as any question that could be raised. . . . The women had been tricked long enough. In the words of the late Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, "Enough of this fooling! We will have no more of it." "Down with the Government!" Let us say that the whole force of the Labor movement will be on the side of the women in demanding that the Government shall make this a government measure. That will be the only way in which to get a solution of this important matter. It was said that it cannot be made a government measure because the Cabinet is divided. What was the Cabinet? Were they living in a democratic country? Because Mr. Asquith and Mr. Harcourt were opposed to votes for women, were their opinions to carry more weight than that of 400 elected representatives in the House of Commons? The Conference should say that if the Government and the Cabinet stand in the way of the expression of the will of the House of Commons, then the Government and the Cabinet must give way.

The amendment was put and declared carried, the voting being:

For	850,000
Against	437,000

The resolution, as amended, was then put and agreed to.

The Conference thus refused to accept further democratization of male suffrage unless accompanied by an extension of female suffrage.

III. THE RESOLUTION OF CONGRESSMAN BERGER, OF THE
UNITED STATES

On January 16, 1912, Congressman Berger introduced in the House of Representatives the following joint resolution, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women:

“Resolved, by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several states, shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution:

“ ‘Article —.

“ ‘Section 1. *The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of sex.*

“ ‘Section 2. When the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice-President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the executive and judicial officers of a state, or the members of the legislature thereof, is denied or in any way abridged on the ground of sex, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such citizens shall bear to the whole number of male and female citizens twenty-one years of age in such state.’ ”

CHAPTER XX

PUBLIC EDUCATION

THE Socialists' interest in education as a question of practical politics has been twofold. They have fought for the extension and improvement of public schools against Catholic opponents, and they have opposed the efforts of the employers and wealthy taxpayers to restrict the development of the schools financially and to convert them into mere training places for the factories. We illustrate the former problem by a report of the struggle of the Belgian Socialists against the Catholics and the latter by the discussion of the industrial education at the American Party Congress of 1912.

I. STRUGGLE OF BELGIAN SOCIALISTS FOR NON-SECTARIAN EDUCATION

Just before the elections of 1914 the Catholic Government of Belgium, after a long and bitter fight, enacted a new school bill. The public school policy exemplified in this bill is one of the chief causes of the demand for the abolition of plural voting and the establishment of equal suffrage. A *New York Times* dispatch thus summarizes the new law:

“The object of the measure is to endow the clerical schools, the staffs of which are almost entirely composed of monks, and it is computed that the desired subventions to these clerical schools will amount annually to \$5,000,000. The bill also provides for subventions to the communal or

municipal schools, but not nearly as liberally as for the clerical schools.

“In Brussels, for instance, the state subvention for the municipal schools will be \$7.37 per scholar, but for the clerical schools \$13.72 per scholar. In Antwerp the subvention for the clerical schools will amount to \$75,000.

“In Belgium, as nowhere else in Europe—not even in Spain—the church forms a political party with a defined policy and with the proclaimed object of controlling the state, hence the object of the Education Bill is to freeze out, as much as possible, the schools started by the municipalities where there may be non-Catholic majorities. The bait that is dangled before the poorer communities is that by turning over their local schools, supported by municipal taxation, to the teaching orders, they can save money. In other words, the municipalities are asked to deliver their children to clerical teachers in return for an exemption from the local education tax.

“The bill does not provide for any state supervision of the way the subventions may be spent, so that, to all intents and purposes, the bill is practically an endowment of the clerical schools.”

It may be added that there are 15,240 denominational and only 5,841 neutral school classes in the country.

1. MANIFESTO OF GENERAL COUNCIL OF LABOR PARTY AGAINST THE LAW

By the projected school law now before the Belgian Chamber, education is made compulsory. In most of the countries of Europe this has passed into legislation more than thirty years ago, and the opposition parties in Belgium have demanded it vainly up to the present.

Compelled by economic circumstances to institute this reform, the Clerical Government wishes to prevent the intellectual emancipation of the workers, which would normally result from the act,

by delivering elementary education into the hands of the Catholic Church.

As all the popes who have succeeded to the papal chair since the French Revolution have condemned our modern liberties, notably the freedom of conscience, the Clericals cloak with the pretense of liberty and equality their attempts against freedom of thought and against the people.

They wish, they say, to secure for the heads of families the free choice of the schools to which their children shall go. It is for this object that the state will give new and considerable subsidies to the private schools!

But, from the preliminary report of the proposed act given by M. Woeste, it appears that the state would refuse any subsidy to a Socialist school or even to a school in which rational moral instruction was given. Further, in our society, governed by the powers of money, it is impossible to have liberty without property. The poor and isolated workers are no more able to send their children to the schools of their own choice than they are to refuse or to accept the conditions of work offered them by the employers.

On the other hand, the Catholic Government, by a cunning yet patient maneuver, by suppressing the greater part of the state elementary schools and favoring in various ways the Clerical schools, have been able to impose male and female instructors trained in Clerical establishments on a large number of anti-Clerical parishes.

Possessing, therefore, devoted agents in many of the schools classed as non-sectarian, directors of the public schools where the administration is in the hands of the Clericals, complete masters of the "adopted" schools and of these "adoptable" (which contain nearly one-half of the total elementary school population), the Catholic Church and its docile accomplice, the Clerical Government, think the hour has arrived to destroy the public and non-sectarian instruction which the large towns and the industrial districts of Walloon have been able to maintain and which have prospered.

They wish, they say, for equality between the public and the private schools!

But all political or philosophical propaganda is prohibited to the state school teacher, while those in the "adopted" schools are free to work for the Catholic Party.

In the system of subsidies which is hidden in the complicated Poulett scheme, the adoptable schools are so favored that in certain cases elementary education will become a source of revenue for the Catholic Church.

Although the provincial and district schools are subject, on the part of the state, to an irritating and often hostile supervision, the Catholic schools will not have even to announce the text-books—and what text-books they are—they will use for the parishes which will have to pay for them.

While the parishes will not be able to provide the scholars with food or clothing or anything at all except instruction, properly speaking, without granting the same favors to the children in the “adoptable” schools, the managers of the latter will be free to attract the workers’ children by all kinds of material advances without at the same time having to obtain them for the public school children.

In this way the Catholic Party hope, as M. Woeste has not hesitated to announce, “to mark the young minds with an indelible impression,” with an impression which leaves them the prey to all kinds of domination and exploitation.

The Belgian Socialist Party, respecting all religious and philosophic convictions, considers always that tolerance and freedom of thought are the most precious conquests of the modern spirit and the indispensable instruments for the improvement of the conditions of the working-class.

Our ideal is free and public elementary education accessible to all children without offense to any religious conviction, preparing, in the words of Hector Denis, “the power which must proceed from universal human solidarity.”

.

2. FROM DECLARATION OF SOCIALIST GROUP IN SENATE AFTER PASSAGE OF THE LAW

By this law the moral education of the children is entirely replaced by religious education; yes, it is even permitted to insult and slander, before the children in the school, all views other than those of the congregations. The school law bears the stamp of a fanatical spirit of caste. We appeal to all towns and democratic communities to resist this fanatical law.

II. INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION AT THE CONGRESS OF THE AMERICAN SOCIALIST PARTY, 1912

The subject of vocational education and guidance has aroused great interest among American Socialists. It will be seen that the reports of the committees make definite recommendations for industrial education, but that the discussion brings out decided opposition to vocational training as at present existing, on the ground that it serves merely to make boys and girls "more efficient servants to a master class."

We take the following from the report on vocational education:

The demand for quick profits, on the one hand, and the necessity for maximum family earnings on the other, have between them done much to destroy the apprenticeship possibilities of modern industry.

The result has been that more than half of the young people who leave the schools at about the age of fourteen drift into occupations which have absolutely no future for them except to continue to work as men and women at wages that can be earned by boys and girls.

Without prejudice to the education of those who are to become professional or agricultural or commercial workers, the schools should fit those whose occupations will be found in the industries. Without loss of those elements in our culture that is the rightful heritage of every boy and girl, each child should have the same opportunity to become an efficient worker as is now given to the four per cent who become professional workers.

It therefore devolves upon the public school to modify and to extend its program to include training for vocational efficiency. It is only the public school that can protect the interests of the children of the public as well as advance those interests.

In this connection attention should be called to a system of

part-time schools which is being tried experimentally at many points. . . . These experiments should be watched with interest, as they must be very instructive as to methods of conducting industrial education; but they are not likely to be entirely satisfactory, since under some of the arrangements the employer determines what boys are or are not to have an opportunity to learn the trade, while under all the plans the employer is in a position to direct the work of the school too much. The employers must not be allowed to control the schools for their advantage any more than a trade-union may be allowed to restrict opportunities of workers to its advantage.

The public schools that have introduced industrial courses with a view to giving industrial education independent of commercial shops are likely to be handicapped at first, and for some time to come, by the lack of suitable equipment and by the impossibility of obtaining suitable teachers in sufficient numbers. But eventually this type of school will probably be the most satisfactory. A temporary device that will have to serve for many years is the continuation school, whether day or evening. . . .

Evening schools should be avoided for young people, as far as possible. The amount of work required of them in shops and factories should be restricted by law, that they may have the opportunity to attend school without detriment to their health and physical development.

.

The following discussion illustrates the point of view of those Socialists who are opposed to the present system of trade education.

Delegate Slobodin [New York]: There is one point on which we are all clear in regard to this question of vocational training, and that is that as Socialists we are opposed to the present system of trade education. *The industrial education which the Socialist desires is different from the industrial education which the capitalists desire.* There is often confusion between training for a trade and scientific industrial training. How can a Socialist at this time stand for training for a trade merely?

.

You see those who advocate the education of the boy or girl

for a mere trade are not advocating what we are striving for. Your boy or girl should be trained in mechanics; the knowledge of general mechanics and the use of tools. The young man or young woman who possesses a knowledge of mechanics and knows how to use tools, can go into many trades, and can acquire a new trade very easily, and can adapt themselves to almost any trade within certain limits.

That is the first thing, then: broad industrial training, and not merely training for one trade.

The second important point is control of the vocational and industrial schools by the working-class, not by the public, as our reporters want to say. . . .

Delegate Clifford [Ohio]: I desire to speak in opposition to this entire report. I do not agree with the comrades here that this Convention should go on record simply as demanding industrial education for our boys and girls. *I do not wish, as a member of the Socialist Party, to go on record through our Convention as favoring the training of our boys and girls merely for the purpose of making them more efficient servants to a master class. I want them to have the highest industrial education.* But it is practically useless for us even to demand that until we get control of our public school system. When we have done that we can put into operation any policy that we see fit, but in the meantime all of this matter should be simmered down to the one main demand; for the industrial education of the boys and girls of the working-class, and let it go at that.

As a consequence of these and other similar criticisms, the above report was not adopted, but was referred to a new standing committee for report at the next convention (1916).

APPENDIX

“PREPAREDNESS”

I. DO SOCIALISTS FAVOR CONSCRIPTION AND UNIVERSAL MILITARY SERVICE?

THE resolution passed at the International Socialist Congress of Stuttgart (see *The Socialists and the War*, Chapters III and IV) favored universal military service. But there was a minority which opposed the idea. The views of both sides need explanation.

The place in the Socialist program of universal military service in the form of a compulsory “militia” or “citizen army” is stated and defended by Morris Hillquit (in *The Metropolitan Magazine*) as follows:

Almost every Socialist Party in the world has a practical program for relieving the prevalent social, economic, and political abuses within the present or “capitalist” régime. And similarly the organized international Socialist movement advances a practical program for partial relief from the evils of wars within the present social system.

The principal measures in the Socialist anti-war program are international peace treaties providing for general limitation of armament, for arbitration of all disputes among nations, and for the establishment of an international court of justice; the abolition of secret diplomacy, and, finally, in countries based on the system of compulsory military service, the gradual shortening of the period of service, with the ultimate object of supplanting the professional standing army by a system of popular militia.

There is nothing distinctively Socialistic in the advocacy of international peace treaties. It is one of the measures which, like so many other planks in the practicable program of Social-

ism, are shared by reformers of all shades. Socialism does not claim a monopoly of progress and does not reject any salutary measure of reform because it has been formulated or adopted by other parties or schools.

Of a somewhat more definitely Socialistic character are the measures which aim at the democratization of international politics and of the national defense. . . . The Socialists demand full publicity of all diplomatic negotiations, and the consent of Parliament to all treaties and declarations of war. In this connection it must be borne in mind that the Socialists stand for unrestricted adult suffrage of all male and female citizens. The Socialist demand, therefore, means that no war shall be declared by any country unless assented to by the women as well as the men of the nation through their chosen representatives in the national legislative body.

But still more fundamental is the proposed Socialist reform in the military organization of each country. The Socialists realize that it would be futile and foolish to preach complete disarmament to any nation while its neighbors and rivals are armed. They frankly acknowledge that under existing conditions each nation must be prepared to defend its integrity and independence against the rest of the world, and must maintain a strong military organization for that purpose. They are, however, opposed to the institution of professional or standing armies, particularly those based on compulsory long-term service, such as prevails in most countries of continental Europe. They maintain that professional armies tend to destroy the civic and industrial usefulness of a large portion of the male population of the country, to alienate the military force from the people, to develop it into an instrument of aggression, and to cripple the efficiency of the national defense. The Socialist ideal of military organization is the popular militia, and as a measure of transition they advocate the progressive reduction of the period of service coupled with an extension of general military training.

"The armament of the people," says the veteran French Socialist and Communard, Edouard Vaillant, "is the necessary complement of universal suffrage and a prerequisite to the development of a true democracy. The militia has historically been the institution of democracy, appearing with its victories, disappearing with its defeats." . . .

The military organization which the Socialists favor is largely

based on the principle of the national militia of Switzerland. Under that system all able-bodied men between the ages of 20 and 48 years are kept in military training and can be relied on for the defense of the country in case of emergency. The main body of the militia, the *ÉLITE*, is composed of the young men between the ages of 20 and 32 years. It is supplemented by the *LANDWEHR*, consisting of the men between the ages of 33 and 44 years, and the *LANDSTURM*, which comprises all male citizens up to the age of 48, who for one reason or another are excluded from the first two classes. The members of the *ÉLITE* are called for brief military drills once in two years and those of the *LANDWEHR* once in four years. Under this system the little Swiss republic, with a population of about three and one-half million, can raise for its defense an army of 540,000 men, and its total military budget approximates only \$7,000,000 per year. The Socialists would improve upon the Swiss militia system by giving the men the right to elect the officers and would supplement it by military education in the public schools. . . .

One of the first tasks of the International Socialist movement, after it emerges from the present European nightmare, will be to inaugurate an active and energetic propaganda for the government ownership and operation of all works engaged in the manufacture of instruments and weapons of national defense.

Aside from this lesson, the terrible events of the last few months have produced no new ideas or ideals for combating the war evil. They have developed nothing to shake our faith in the Socialist anti-military program. The only legitimate lesson which the Socialists can draw from the great European catastrophe is that hereafter they will have to struggle more earnestly, more indefatigably, and more implacably than ever for the speedy realization of their immediate as well as their ultimate program.

In an earlier number of the same magazine (April, 1914), Jean Jaurès made a long defense of the proposed system as advocated by the French Socialist Party. He said in part:

The position of the Socialist Party must not be misunderstood. It has by means taken a merely negative attitude of opposi-

tion to militarism, regardless of consequences. If it has clearly seen the political and social significance of the military question, it has not for one moment ignored the problem of national defense. . . .

Jaurès proceeds to describe the universal and compulsory militia system favored by most French Socialists.

He then continues:

Such an organization as this may still appear very militaristic in the eyes of Anglo-Saxons, who are happily unacquainted with the burdens borne by continental Europe. But let them compare it with the system which to-day weighs upon the French people and which is growing heavier year by year, and they will see what an immense progress this military reform would mean for republican France.

On these lines the armed nation will attain the maximum of defensive power, and France will be able to protect itself against any attack. If it be said that such an army, while admittedly effective for defensive purposes, would be ill suited for aggressive warfare, we answer that this is just what we desire. In the present state of the world no great nation can disarm itself without thereby inviting assault. The democratic organization of the armed nation, if it is the best safeguard for national independence, is also the best guaranty of international peace. An army so mingled and identified with the nation and partaking in its economic, social, and civic life cannot, like one separated from the people and devoted to war as a trade, be used for the purposes of conquest and imperialism. It can be strong in battle only on condition that the citizens who compose it are convinced of the justice and necessity of the war in which they are engaged. And they can have this consciousness only if the nation has first, by offering in good faith to submit the disputed question to arbitration, cleared itself of all moral responsibility for the resort to arms.

It is by continuing the policy of international arbitration, and at the same time transforming the professional or semi-professional army of to-day into a thoroughly organized and thoroughly democratic defensive force that we seek to assure France of independence, dignity, and peace, until the day when the socialization of the world's economic life will permit the nations

to abolish not only the savagery of war, but also the barbarism of armed peace.

The attitude of the German Party may be seen in the speech of Heinrich Schulz to the German Party Congress of 1913. Schulz, presenting the official report for the Reichstag group, presented the citizen army as an “ideal,” and a distant one at that, one not to be realized in the present order, but only as an element of Socialist society. He spoke in part as follows:

We are attacking a present capitalistic, imperialistic military system, because it is a weapon in the hands of the present society. But we do not oppose a people's army. In fact we demand it in our party platform, we call for the militia to take the place of the present standing army, we agitate for the best possible physical and mental training from earliest childhood, thus assuring to our people the most efficient means of self-defense. We cannot do away with the present standing army by parliamentary law in a day. *Nor can we realize our ideal of a people's army completely in the present order of society.* But it is our duty, nevertheless, to do our utmost to change the present military system by criticism and reform, as far as this is possible within capitalist society. The character of these reforms will be determined by our final aim, they will be steps toward *the eventual fulfillment of the ideal of a people's army.* This must determine our attitude toward the minor questions of present-day militarism, must lead us to initiate reforms which point *in the direction of the Socialist ideals.*

The French and German proposals merely carry out in detail the plan long indorsed by nearly all the Socialists of the continent. The Stuttgart anti-war resolution, passed by the International Socialist Congress of 1907, contained the following clause:

The Congress sees in the democratic organization of armies, as expressed in the so-called “citizen armies,” in place of standing

armies, a good guarantee against warlike attacks of one nation by another, and against the existence of national differences.

Although many of the British and American delegates had expressed themselves against this clause, none voted against the resolution, of which the clause was a part.

By agreement with the British and American delegates, however, Chairman Vandervelde, who officially reported to the Congress on the anti-war resolution, made the following statement:

Opposition to a militia [universal compulsory military service under democratic management] came from two quarters [in the committee]. The Swiss comrades pointed out that their militia was commanded by officers of the ruling class and was used by the bourgeoisie against the working-people. Our answer was that the Swiss militia had a class character and was far removed from the arming of the people demanded by us.

Another earnest attack was made by the English, who have no national army. They opposed any expansion of armament and the importation of militarism into their country. Accordingly, we took a stand against the arming of the people in those fortunate countries which "have no standing army in the Continental sense."

The last-mentioned countries were accordingly excepted in the resolution.

In England, any form of conscription might seem to be retrogression, but Socialists always have in mind the great revolutionary possibility in putting arms in the hands of every citizen. The Socialist advocates of a citizen army in England are divided into two parts, those who believe that strong armies will be necessary as long as capitalism lasts, and those who hope that a citizen army may be able to effect a social revolution, and when the time comes, to establish Socialism. Or the same individual may hold both views.

The British Socialist Party (the smaller of the two leading Socialist organizations of that country) discussed at its Annual Conference of 1914, a resolution which contained the following passage:

We point out that a standing army will always be a ready instrument in the hands of the governing class for aggression abroad and the repression of popular liberties and working-class interests at home, and we call for the organization of a national democratic citizen army for purposes of national defense alone as the only alternative to conscript militarism and the only sure guarantee of national and international peace.

This resolution was not passed, but it obtained the votes of 58 branches to 76 against it.

The I. L. P., the larger of the two Socialist parties, on the other hand, has continued its opposition to all forms of compulsory military service. At the Conference of April, 1915, on the motion of Coventry Branch, seconded by Norwich Branch, the following resolution was agreed to unanimously:

That this Conference affirms its previous decisions in opposition to conscription or any form of compulsory service, and expresses its disapproval of any attempt to introduce any system of compulsory military training, whether in the form of conscription or by the despicable method of closing the industrial market to eligible young men with the object of compelling them to offer their services to the military authorities.

Brougham Villiers, of the I. L. P., writing in their official monthly,* gave the grounds for the opposition to the citizen army idea, in part, as follows:

Unless what we are saying every day is all nonsense, the nations of the world have no real quarrel, and in a Socialist

* *The Socialist Review*, January-March, 1915.

world there would and could be no war. The logical implication is that there would be no armies, either "citizen" or any other, for it is simply inconceivable that the world will go on making arms and ammunition and training men to use them as soon as it is certain that peace will be permanent. Such a constant rehearsal for a drama, which everyone knows will never come off, is incredible, and sooner or later we may be certain that a Socialist world would cease to arm itself, just as modern men have given up nose rings and war paint.

But considered as a palliative, a reform within the capitalist system, a citizen army would be a real advance in countries where military necessity has compelled the enlistment of the whole male population. Just as in a protectionist country a free-trader may consistently work for a reduction of duties down to the level advocated by British tariff reformers, so an anti-militarist in a conscript country may support this milder form of compulsory service. It is an entirely different matter in a country where military service is neither universal nor compulsory, and to import the continental doctrine of a "citizen army" into this country because it is an immediate aim of European Socialism is to become impracticable doctrinaires, and that not about a principle, but for the sake of a mere palliative.

Yet that is what a number of Socialists continually advocate, though it is only fair to say that an attempt is made to support the propaganda by some reference to principle and a conception of labor needs. The defense of the country against aggression being regarded as a universal duty, it is held to be incumbent upon everyone to become an efficient soldier. This is an extraordinary inference from the Socialist principle that everyone ought to do his share in the work of the world. In the case of no other calling do we turn from the general idea of duty to perform *some* work to the assumed duty of doing any particular form of work. Though it is as necessary to protect the nation from internal lawbreakers as to resist the aggression of foreign enemies, it has never yet, as far as I know, been suggested that everybody should take his turn as a policeman. We are quite satisfied that if everyone is taxed and rated for his or her share of the cost of police work, the duty of the citizen is accomplished. Indeed, only in that way can such a duty be universally fulfilled. The notion behind this argument for universal service

is essentially reactionary. For, of course, universal personal military service is impossible. If military service is a duty of citizenship, then women and all men below the military standard of height and chest measurement are incapable of performing citizen duties—a doctrine likely enough to please anti-suffragists and other reactionaries, but not likely to convince Socialists. The idea that there is anything specially sacrosanct about the duty of national defense which does not apply to any other work is incompatible with anti-militarism; it is, in fact, an especially vicious sort of militarism.

Only, perhaps, when the citizen army is defended on the ground that in time of revolution a professional army would fire on the people, while a citizen army would refuse to do so, does the propaganda have any relation to other Socialist ideas. The belief is that our present army could be relied on to obey any order, while one enlisted on “citizen” lines would not. And if the agitation simply confined itself to advocating—as on the continent—a change in the discipline and organization of the army, and repudiated any intention to increase its size, or to adopt compulsion, this would be all right. Citizen rights for the voluntary soldier, better pay, and greater freedom can be advocated without rushing to the help of the National Service League. Even so, however, the dangers, from which the new discipline is intended to secure us, are somewhat shadowy, and the method proposed of doubtful efficacy. The idea seems to be that the people will some day rise in mass against their oppressors and demand the downfall of capitalism—a notion we have heard before. Probably in such a case an alarmed capitalist government would proclaim martial law and order out the soldiers to suppress the rising. Soldiers accustomed to barrack discipline would be more likely to obey than those of a “citizen” army, but there is no certainty either way. There have been mutinies against intolerable orders among all sorts of troops, while even the slackest militia discipline may be enough.

But the dilemma is very improbable. If there is to be civil war over the coming of Socialism, it will be the capitalists, not the workers, who will rebel, and it will be a Labor, and not a Tory or Liberal, government that will give the army its orders. Is it conceivable that the electors should be so nearly contented with things as they are as to return a Liberal or Conservative government to power and then become so furiously revolutionary

in less than five years as to insist on turning out into the streets and risk fighting the soldiers rather than wait till the dissolution of Parliament to give them a chance? I hope not, for I confess I have very little hope that such an unstable populace could construct any worthy Socialism at all. In the meantime, any government that brings in a reform will certainly be willing to defend it. Progress, even under a Labor or Socialist government, is never likely to be disturbing enough to induce our big manufacturers and landlords to risk all in a gallant charge against the bayonets of the army. In short, the "citizen army" Socialists are aiding a most mischievous campaign because of an imaginary danger.

Even on the Continent there is some Socialist criticism of the citizen army plan. In their Congress of November 1, 1915, and in the resulting discussion afterwards, it appeared that the majority of Swiss Socialists believe that the "Swiss System," as it actually works, makes the army a serviceable tool against strikers, and so a large part of the Socialist members of the Federal Council, including some of those from German Switzerland, refuse the army their votes even in these war times.

There is also criticism of this "armed nation" plan in Holland—which is similarly smitten by the present war—as the following quotation from a leading Dutch Socialist (Wibaüt) will show:

If at the end of the war the Social Democrats of the countries at war, and those of the countries which remained neutral, recognize these results of nationalism, they will unite their efforts in making the terms of peace *the starting-point* of the abandonment of national armaments. The next peace will be nothing more than an armistice, if it does not *prepare the way* to the abandonment of arms.

It is on this basis that the Social Democrats of all countries will have to join at the end of this war. *The question is not whether they will be strong enough to enforce this basis of peace upon the peacemaking countries. The question is whether they*

will realize that this basis is essential for the development of international Social Democracy.

The European war has not found the proletariat sufficiently strong to prevent it. But it has taught us the lesson—a cruel lesson it is—that wars cannot be prevented if they have come near at hand. The lesson is, that wars must be forestalled by preventing preparation for them, by directing all the force of the proletariat against national armaments.

The Socialist action against militarism has, in some countries on the European continent, taken the form of advocating the "armed nation" [the so-called Swiss "militia" or "citizen army" system] as an alternative to standing armies in the service of the governing classes. The present war puts the question, whether this form of fighting the militarist system should be continued and generally adopted.

The present war is a "war of machines." It is many times more murderous than previous wars, but it kills in accordance with the rules of technical science. This development of warfare throws new light on the system of the "armed nation."

The "armed nation" now and henceforth means a nation equipped with all the war machinery human spirit has invented for the destruction of mankind—mankind on the other side of the frontier.

It will thus become a point of discussion between Socialists whether the plan of the "armed nation" to fight militarism may still hold good. We have personally little doubt that the issue of such discussion will lead to the giving up of the plan of the "armed nation" and the adoption of the position of antagonism to all systems of national armaments.

.

The following is the anti-war manifesto and peace program adopted by the Socialist Party of the United States, September, 1915:

The supreme crisis in human history is upon us.

European civilization is engulfed. The world's peace is shattered. The future of the human race is imperiled.

The immediate causes of the war are obvious. Previous wars and the terms of settlement which created lasting hatreds and

bred thoughts of revenge; imperialism and commercial rivalries: the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente dividing all Europe into two hostile camps; secret intrigue of diplomats and lack of democracy; vast systems of military and naval equipment; fear and suspicion bred and spread by a vicious jingo press in all nations; powerful armament interests that reap rich harvests out of havoc and death,—all these have played their sinister part. But back of all these factors lie the deeper and more fundamental causes, causes rooted in the very system of capitalist production.

Every capitalist nation on earth exploits its people. The wages received by the workers are insufficient to enable them to purchase all they need for the proper sustenance of their lives. A surplus of commodities accumulates. The capitalists cannot consume it all. It must be exported to foreign countries.

In every capitalist nation it becomes increasingly difficult for the capitalists to re-invest their accumulated profits to advantage in their own country, with their people destitute and their resources fully developed and exploited. The capitalists are constantly forced to look for new and foreign fields of investment.

In many countries of Europe, limited territorially and densely populated, the supply of natural resources is insufficient to support the large volume of industrial requirements. The capitalists must look for new sources of raw materials and supplies, to less developed foreign countries.

Hence arise the commercial struggles between the nations, the rivalries for the acquisition of foreign colonies, the efforts to defend and extend the oversea "possessions"; the policies of imperialism, the conflicts for commercial supremacy, ever growing more intense and fierce as the nations expand and the world's field of conquest narrows. Hence arise the policies of armaments every year more immense and monstrous. Hence arise the strategy, the intrigues of secret diplomacy, till all the world is involved in a deadly struggle for the capture and control of the world market.

Thus capitalism, inevitably leading to commercial rivalry and imperialism and functioning through the modern state with its vast armaments, secret diplomacies, and undemocratic governments, logically leads to war.

Reactionary ruling classes sometimes also deliberately plunge

countries into war for the purpose of crushing progressive movements by creating false patriotic excitement and thus side-tracking the real class issues. Every war, furthermore, is used by the capitalists in order to destroy the organized forces of the labor movement.

For more than half a century the Socialist movement has warned the world of this impending tragedy. With every power at their command the Socialists of all nations have worked to prevent it. But the warning has gone unheeded, and the Socialist propaganda against imperialism, militarism, and war, has been ignored by the ruling powers and the majority of the people of all the nations.

To-day our prediction has been only too swiftly and too tragically fulfilled. War, with all its horrors, is upon us.

And it has come as the logical and inevitable outcome of the forces of the capitalist system. It has come in spite of the warnings and protests of the Socialist and labor movements and indeed in spite of the personal desires of many of the capitalists themselves. The capitalist system is a modern Frankenstein which is destroying its own creators.

If this unspeakable tragedy shall serve to demonstrate to the world, and particularly to the workers of all nations, the real and fundamental causes of war so that by removing these causes man henceforth may live at peace, the war may be worth the cost.

If, on the other hand, the people shall remain blind to the terrible lessons of this war, and leave the destinies of the world in the hands of unscrupulous, war-inciting capitalist rulers, then indeed is this world war an unmitigated curse. For, if the causes that brought on this war are left to operate, then this war will not be the last. It will be only the first of a series of wars more terrible and more tragic, until one mighty and monstrous imperialism has drenched the world in blood and subdued the peoples in abject slavery. Socialism alone will ultimately save mankind from the standing menace of self-destruction.

The supreme duty of the hour is for us, the Socialists of all the world; therefore, to summon all Labor forces of the world for an aggressive and uncompromising opposition to the whole capitalist system, and to every form of its most deadly fruits—militarism and war; to strengthen the bonds of working-class solidarity, to deepen the currents of conscious internationalism,

and to proclaim to the world a constructive program leading towards permanent peace.

The Socialists of America extend the hand of comradeship to their unfortunate brothers in all countries now ravaged by the war, the sufferers and victims of the vicious system which has engulfed them in fratricidal carnage. We convey to them our unfaltering faith in the world-wide class struggle, in international Socialism, and in brotherhood of man. We proclaim our determination to join our comrades in all countries in the task of rebuilding the Socialist International upon such a basis that henceforth it cannot be shaken by the most violent storms of capitalist conflicts.

To the Socialist and Labor forces in all the world and to all who cherish the ideals of justice, we make our appeal, believing that out of the ashes of this mighty conflagration will yet arise the deeper internationalism and the great democracy and peace.

OUR PROGRAM

I.—Terms of peace at the close of the present war should be based on the following provisions:

1.—No indemnities.

2.—No transfer of territory except upon the consent and by the vote of the people within the territory.

3.—All countries under foreign rule be given political independence if demanded by the inhabitants of such countries.

II.—International Federation—The United States of the World

1. An international congress with legislative and administrative powers over international affairs and with permanent committees in place of present secret diplomacy.

2. Special commissions to consider international disputes as they may arise. The decisions of such commissions to be enforced without resort to arms. Each commission to go out of existence when the special problem that called it into being is solved.

3. International ownership and control of strategic waterways, such as the Dardanelles, the Straits of Gibraltar, and the Suez, Panama, and Kiel Canals.

4. Neutralization of the seas.

III.—*Disarmament*

1. Universal disarmament as speedily as possible.
2. Pending complete disarmament:
 - a. Abolition of the manufacture of arms and munitions of war for private profit, and prohibition of exportation of arms, war equipment, and supplies from one country to another.
 - b. No increase in existing armaments under any circumstances.
 - c. No appropriations for military or naval purposes.

IV.—*Extension of Democracy*

1. Political democracy.
 - a. Abolition of secret diplomacy; democratic control of foreign policies.
 - b. Universal suffrage, including woman suffrage.
2. Industrial democracy.

Radical social changes in all countries to eliminate the economic causes of war, such as will be calculated gradually to take the industrial and commercial processes of the nations out of the hands of the irresponsible capitalist class and place them in the hands of the people, to operate them collectively for the satisfaction of human wants and not for private profits, in co-operation and harmony, and not through competition and war.

Immediate Action

Immediate and energetic efforts shall be made through the organizations of the Socialist parties of all nations to secure universal co-operation of all Socialist and labor organizations and all true friends of peace to obtain the indorsement of this program.

In January, 1916, the American Socialist Party published brief statements on military preparedness from all national candidates, either for party offices (secretary and members of the executive committee) or for public office (presidential and vice-presidential nominations).

We give the responses of those who already hold, or

have held, the most important party offices—also the responses of all the presidential candidates and of Gaylord, the Socialist congressional candidate who came nearest to election in 1914 (except Meyer London, who was elected) :

By Allan L. Benson, Socialist Nominee for the Presidency

I am opposed to any addition whatever to our army and navy. I believe we are in less danger of invasion than we have been at any other time in 100 years. I believe this danger, never great, will become less as the European belligerents proceed toward exhaustion. I believe that for this nation greatly to strengthen its army and navy would be likely to bring war, first by alarming other peoples and causing them to arm against us, second by giving the American capitalist class a greater temptation to try to conquer markets by force of arms.

I am not opposed in principle to the defense of this country from invasion. I believe invasion should be resisted. But there is ample naval authority for the statement that the invasion of continental United States could be resisted without a navy. Mines have for seventeen months defended both the German coast and the German navy. Mines do not take boys from their homes into the army, nor can they be used to break strikes nor to attack any nation that is not far from home seeking trouble.

Second: Democratic selection of all officers.

Third: Each such soldier to retain his firearm with at least two hundred rounds of ammunition, furnished by the Government, in his home.

Fourth: The Government to make all munitions.

Fifth: No part of the military force to be called into service by the Government during strikes nor aggressive wars against other nations.

Sixth: This military arrangement shall displace all present military forces.

By George H. Goebel

I am absolutely opposed to militarism. And just as emphatically against the so-called preparedness—which is but a smooth word to accustom us to the idea of wholesale blood-spilling.

When a false alarm of fire is raised in a theater, it is a calamity

indeed if there be not even one masterful personality to calm the tumult and stay the tragedy of lives crushed out in the unreasoning stampede of a crazed mob!

And just so it is the mission and duty of every Socialist, and the Socialist Party, to set their faces like flint against the whole damnable business of war and its handmaiden, preparedness.

Let others parley and use fine phrases. I hold that our business is to make it emphatic that we will have none of it. To serve as the clear voice in the roaring tumult!

By Morris Hillquit

I am opposed to “preparedness” because preparedness means militarism. I am opposed to militarism because militarism leads to wars between nations. I am opposed to wars between nations because they obscure the struggle of the classes, enfeeble the workers physically and morally, and retard the progress of the Socialist movement.

I realize that the modern capitalist system, based on international rivalry for foreign markets and for the control of undeveloped territory, tends to breed wars, but I do not believe that it is the part of Socialists to support these tendencies.

I hold that wars, like many other evil outgrowths of capitalism, can be checked by enlightened and determined mass opposition, and that it is the duty of the Socialists to lead in such opposition.

I have learned from the sad lesson of Europe that when the war furies break loose they are apt to carry everything before them, including the Socialist and Labor movements; but that is an added reason why the Socialists should oppose all preparations for war while there is yet time.

By Arthur Le Sueur

“Preparedness” is the master fraud of the masters. It results in the thing it is said to prevent. The only war in which workers should enlist is the “class war,” the cause of all other wars.

We should oppose with action any effort of our Government to force us to fight the workers of any land. Action means revolution at an opportune time. An opportune time is when the masters send us at each others throats, and we should then seize the opportunity to fight our real enemy—the masters. This should

not be with words alone, but with such means as they may compel us to use.

Revolution is the only remedy for despotism, whether it be political or industrial.

As immediate steps in preparation for successful revolution we should abolish the private profit in the manufacture of arms and munitions, prevent the increase of army and navy, compel legislation allowing democratic military organization of the "workers." Those who do the fighting to give the final orders: to the end that we may be prepared against hell's own breed in every land, the masters, the murderers of humanity and brotherhood.

By James H. Maurer

I am opposed to the program of so-called preparedness, as submitted by President Wilson, or by any group of war promoters. It is, therefore, hardly necessary to say that I am also opposed to militarism.

I stand by the anti-war manifesto and program adopted by the national committee last May and ratified by the party membership. I could also agree with the Socialist Party if it said not another dollar for warships of any kind, transports included; not another dollar to privately owned manufactories of army and navy supplies. If we must prepare, then mine our coasts, furnish a submarine for every fifty miles or less of our coast, enlist every citizen between the ages of twenty and forty years, arm them with the latest improved rifles and a thousand rounds of ammunition, every such soldier to do drill duty two weeks in each year, elect their own officers, and keep their rifles and ammunition in their homes.

By A. M. Simons

I oppose all phrases of militarism and all preparation for war between capitalist nations. The entrance of this nation into armament competition means that this war will end only in a truce leading to other wars. But if the American ruling class is not permitted to arm it must work for international disarmament. I oppose using the Socialist Party to defend militarism anywhere and see in such attempted use one of the main excuses for the militarist sentiment among American Socialists. The

Socialist Party should stand for internationalism and disarmament and give its aid internationally to those Socialists in each nation who oppose militarism and nationalism. I oppose the effort to introduce the spirit of military discipline into the national and international Socialist movement for the benefit of a bureaucracy of office-holders or office-seekers in suppression of democracy.

By John Spargo

I am now, as I have always been, irreconcilably opposed to militarism. I regard it as the most pressing duty of American Socialists to-day to vigorously oppose the sinister attempt to commit this nation to militarism under the misleading title of “preparedness.” It should be our great endeavor to create in the masses a hatred of militarism in all its forms; to oppose to the growing militaristic psychology the psychology of internationalism and proletarian solidarity.

I am not a non-resistant, and can readily conceive of conditions which would lead me to fight. For example, to resist and repel actual invasion by a barbarian horde would be the duty of a Socialist commonwealth. But I insist that the United States is safer from attack from any quarter of the world than at any time in her history. For the present, and for some years to come, we are absolutely free from any danger of attack. Therefore, the proposal to saddle us with a heavy military burden is indefensible from every point of view. We must fight it to the uttermost.

By Carl D. Thompson

I am absolutely and with all my might opposed to the present militaristic propaganda that is going under the name of “preparedness.” I feel that the Socialist Party should use its utmost wisdom, tact, and power in combating it.

This, however, is negative. The best way to combat any of the evils of capitalism is to put forward something better, something that supplants the evil and makes it impossible. And we have in our national party program and in the international program the greatest and the most inspiring constructive task in human history. I refer especially, of course, to our program for the development of a federation of nations, a sort of United States of the World, with an international congress and court,

universal disarmament, and the erection of the World International. While fighting "preparedness," let us urge forward the International.

By Victor L. Berger

I am opposed to standing armies of any kind. A standing army is always the tool of the ruling class. America at the present time not only has a standing army, but the worst kind of a standing army, one of hired mercenaries. Our national defense force is mainly recruited from the "submerged tenth" and is officered by trained aristocrats.

Our standing army is a standing menace to our democracy at home, and is of questionable effectiveness against any attack from without.

Any nation, class, or individual that is defenseless, however, will soon be enslaved or cease to exist. All history bears witness to this fact. There is no known exception.

A nation or a class that wants to become free, or that wants to stay free, must have great power of resistance. It must be prepared to fight for its freedom at any time.

Docility and non-resistance will soon reduce any people or any class to the level of the Chinese and Hindus. Moreover, any man who is unwilling, or not ready, to fight for his wife or his daughters, does not deserve to have a wife or daughters. Any man who is unwilling to fight for his class or nation does not deserve to belong to a class or a nation.

I am, therefore, in favor of a "preparedness" that shall protect and unite the bulk of our nation, that is, the working-people.

For that purpose we must train the bodies and minds of all our young folks,—not only those of the few select who have a chance to attend academies and universities. We want all of our people to be able to defend themselves and the common weal.

Our defense must be democratic and industrial. We want a preparedness that will develop the faculties of the workers, add to their power of resistance, and aid them in their struggle for existence.

We want to abolish hunger, want, and misery—as a part of this preparedness. We want comfortable homes and protection in old age and sickness—as a part of this preparedness. We

want healthy and harmoniously educated men and women—able fathers and mothers—as a part of this preparedness.

Thus preparedness must become a part of our early education by practicing calisthenics in our common schools and encouraging outdoor sports from childhood on, in order to produce healthy men and women. But this cannot be all.

We propose that the public school system be made a part of “preparedness” in the following manner:

Every citizen should devote one year—between nineteen and twenty—to the service of his nation. Every citizen—male or female—may stay at home during the time, but receive for the service such pay as will be fixed by congressional legislation, because this education must be in charge of the nation and the nation must pay for it.

We propose to make the public school system the center of our country's defense. For that purpose a workshop should be added to every school district. And every young man and young woman should be educated in handling modern tools on wood and iron. They should learn how to operate machinery and understand the make-up of an automobile, an aeroplane, or a machine gun. One year of service would be sufficient to teach them all of that and a good deal more.

This education should consider the needs and advantages of the respective districts. But everybody should learn how to plant a tree, construct a road, or build a bridge. And everybody should also practice at the target during that time. Girls should also learn how to give aid and comfort to the sick and wounded.

No able-bodied man or woman should be exempt from this national duty on account of money, rank, or class privilege. The details of that education could be easily worked out as the experience would require.

Such a year of national service will be a welcome interruption of the task of the factory worker or the clerk in city offices and stores—it will teach him many new things and make a more useful citizen of him. It will be a most excellent “top-off” to the education of a young farmer. It will have an immensely democratizing influence upon the college boy, besides giving him advantages that he could not get from books.

Moreover, such preparedness will absolutely guard the national independence until such time as we shall have complete disarmament and world's peace by international agreement, but it will

be useless for aggression. It will protect the working-class against further subjugation and enslavement at home until all class distinctions are abolished.

This kind of preparedness will not only effectively protect the American people against attacks from without, but also against the foes of democracy from within. It will forever abolish the misuse of public military forces, as well as armed private thugs.

And last, but not least, this will be a "preparedness" by the entire nation, militant and prepared, not by a capitalist class or by insidious clerical forces, arming quietly all kinds of "knights."

In short, I refuse to be carried away by any hysteria caused by this world war. We Socialists are more opposed to militarism than ever. But the Socialist Party is not for "peace at any price." War may be hell, but there are some things in this world worse than "hell." Real Socialists are willing to fight them.

By Winfield R. Gaylord

The world war has proven: (1) that we live in an historical "war zone"; (2) that an effective national mobilization must include every national resource and equipment, mental, moral, and physical, under highest co-ordination.

The Socialist Party in the United States must present a corresponding program of preparedness for peace and against war, essentially along the following lines:

a. Mobilization of National Morale

1. Universal suffrage.
2. Adequate preventive hygiene and medicine.
3. Remodeling of educational system for social welfare training.
4. Recognition, in advance, of organized labor's responsibility and just deserts, to secure a dependable industrial army.
5. Abolish secret diplomacy, with its lies and spies.
6. Repudiate protection of foreign concessions, the principal demand for a big navy.

b. Mobilization of National Production

1. Completion of postal savings bank system.
2. Nationalize transport and communications equipment.

3. Nationalize mines, forests, and water-powers.
4. Nationalize food storage and manufacture.
5. Nationalize manufacture of chemicals.

c. Mobilization of Military Forces and Materials

1. Nationalized merchant marine, to furnish loyal and efficient naval recruits, with officers, and ships ready for war equipment.

2. Permanent defense army of 500,000, with definite service term; employed on public works; at civilian pay; with military organization, drill, and equipment; having full political rights (to promote mobilization experience of staff officers, reduce unemployed army, and increase production capacity, offsetting military expense).

3. Enlarged corps of trained military officers, employed with permanent defense army in productive occupations after training.

4. Government plants for munitions manufacture, and accumulations of raw materials rather than finished products of military stores.

5. Universal military education, by publication of general staff theories of defense, as applied to finance, industry, agriculture, diplomacy, and military practice.

6. Coast defense of mine fields and submarines.

By Adolph Germer

Briefly stated, I am opposed to what is euphoniously called “preparedness.” There is far less danger of an invasion by a foreign foe than by the American Plunderbund. We should oppose everything that smacks of militarism. Teach the art of peace rather than the “art” of war.

But, if the people *insist* that there *must* be a military organization, then:

First: Let every able-bodied man between eighteen and forty-five get one month’s training each year with full pay by his employer.

(See also pp. 509-522.)

INDEX

A

Adler, Victor, 6, 292.
 Agriculture, 80, 140, 141, 171, 185, 200, 213, 214, 217, 322, 326, 350, 406, 450, 453-468, 506; *see also* Land Question.
 Allemanistes, 11.
 Alliances, Electoral, 11-24, 40-46, 59-64, 93, 109, 172, 174, 176, 289, 295-298, 391, 392, 539-544.
 Alliances, Parliamentary, 11-24, 46.
 America. *See* United States.
American Socialist, The, 504.
 Anarchists, 8, 12, 68, 226, 367, 376, 384, 387, 404, 418.
 Ancona Congress, 91.
 Anderson, W. C., 327, 469, 526.
 Anseele, 6, 293, 393, 395, 397.
Appeal to Reason, 57.
 Arbitration of Labor Disputes. *See* Compulsory Arbitration.
 Argentina, Socialist Movement in, 25, 249-254.
 Armament. *See* Militarism and Disarmament.
 Asquith, 599, 600.
 Australia, Socialist and Labor Movements in, 309-339; *see also* Government Ownership, High Cost of Living, Militarism, Social Insurance, Strikes.
 Austria, Socialist Movement in, 25, 155-162; *see also* High Cost of Living, Labor Unions, Militarism, Universal Suffrage.
 Autonomy, Local. *See* Home Rule.

B

Balkan League, 189.
 Balkan War, 62, 164, 183.
 Bang, Gustav, 137.
 Barthou, M., 512.
 Basle Congress, 4, 6.
 Bauer, Otto, 155, 411, 413, 414.
 Bavaria, 15.
 Bebel, August, 6, 9, 16, 17, 18, 19.
 Belgium, Socialist Movement in, 6, 7, 14, 18, 19, 25, 70-75; *see also* Clericalism, Education, Labor Unions, Taxation, Universal Suffrage.
 Benson, Allan L., 624.
 Berger, Victor, 206, 233, 249, 483, 601, 628.
 Berlin, 29.
 Bernstein, 6, 43, 408.
 Berntsen, Klaus, 138.
 Bertrand, L., 293, 396.
 Bicameral System, 50, 113, 135, 184, 205, 213.
 Bismarck, 23.
 Bissolati, 76, 78.
 Blanquists, 11, 16.
 Bohemia, 7.
 Bohn, Frank, 384, 387.
 Bohn, Wm. E., 152, 517.
 Bonomi, 78, 79.
 Boroughs, S. H., 236.
 Bos, Dr., 120, 121, 123.
 Brand, J., 283.
 Brandenburg, 29.
 Branting, Hjalmar, 148, 149, 528.
 Briand, 57, 62, 66, 119, 390;
 Briandism, 59.

British Empire. *See* Great Britain, Ireland, Australia, New Zealand, Canada, South Africa.
 Brocqueville, de, 394, 396, 398, 399.
 Brussels Congress, 8.
 Budget Question, 22, 131, 485, 486-494.
 Buelow, Count, 36.
 Bulgaria, Socialist Movement in, 7, 13, 25, 187-188.
 Burns, John, 6, 22.

C

Cabrini, 78.
 Caetani, Prince, 81.
Call, The New York, 99, 130.
 Camacho, Brito, 177.
 Canada, Socialist Movement in, 25, 235-242; *see also* Labor Unions, Universal Suffrage.
 Capital Punishment Abolished, 34.
 Carnegie, Andrew, 319.
 Central America, 253.
 Chamberlain, Joseph, 581.
 Child Labor, 34, 200, 204, 211, 239, 258, 287, 288, 439, 456.
 Chile Socialists, 25.
 China, Socialist and Republican Movements in, 357-369; *see also* Education, Government Ownership, Militarism, Universal Suffrage.
 Churchill, Winston, 338.
 Ciccotti, 89.
 Cipriani, A., 7.
 Class Struggle, 8, 15, 16, 17, 31, 79, 109, 124, 201, 229, 238, 295, 297, 336, 339, 374, 404.
 Clericalism, 16, 22; in Belgium, 18, 72, 391 ff., 402, 602-605; in England, 288; in France, 17, 59, 64; in Germany, 33-37, 39; in Holland, 114, 120-122, 125; in Ireland, 299-307; in Italy, 85 ff.; in Roumania, 185; in the United States, 201, 229.

Clynes, J. R., 260.
 Coalition Government, 11-14, 72, 77, 79, 143, 151, 152, 341.
 Cocca, N. D., 183.
 Collectivism. *See* Public Ownership.
 Colonialism. *See* Militarism.
 Commune, The, 57.
 Communism, 363.
Communist Manifesto, 3.
 Compensation, 286.
 Compère-Morel, 5, 61, 376-378.
 Compulsory Arbitration of Labor Disputes, 272, 431-437.
 Congresses, Socialist. *See* Names of Countries.
 Connolly, 302, 304.
 Conservation, 39, 86, 203, 212.
 Conservatives. *See* Names of Countries.
 Constitutional Questions, 15, 60, 64, 109, 113, 139, 205, 220, 309, 317-319, 327, 329.
 Conventions, Socialist. *See* Names of Countries.
 Co-operation, 71, 74, 132, 164, 204, 307, 449, 450, 457, 466, 582-585.
 Copenhagen Congress, 5.
Cosmopolis, The, 23.
 Costa, Afonso, 177.
 Costa, Andrea, 7.
 Crime, 38, 200, 204.
 Cummings, David, 99.
 Cuneo, Francisco, 250.
 Customs Duties. *See* Tariff.

D

Daly, 302.
 da Silva, Manuel José, 177.
 Deakin, 519, 521.
 de Almeida, Antonio José, 177.
 de Ambris, 89.
 de Brouckère, 396.
 Debs, Eugene V., 225, 233, 380, 383, 388.
 Debts, Public, 91.
 Decentralization. *See* Home Rule.

De Lara, Guitterez, 243.
 Delassale, Paul, 381.
 De Leon, Daniel, 232, 233.
 Denis, 396.
 Denmark, Socialists in, 7, 25, 129-144; *see also* Labor Unions, Militarism, Universal Suffrage.
 de Paape, Cesar, 6.
 Depew, Chauncey M., 318.
 Destrée, 395, 397.
 Diaz, 246.
 Dickmann, Enrique, 250.
 Diplomacy, Secret. *See* Militarism.
 Direct Action, 270 ff., 381-388.
 Direct Legislation. *See* Initiative and Referendum.
 Disarmament, 79, 623; *see also* Militarism.
 Dobrogeanu-Gherea, C., 181.
 Dracoules, Dr., 189, 190.
 Dragu, Th., 183.
 Dresden Congress, 15, 19; Resolution, 15-24.
 Drink Problem, 219, 258, 288, 562, 586-593.
 Dubery, H., 596, 597.
 Dubreuilh, 378.
 Duncan (Mayor), 566.

E

Education, in Belgium, 391, 393, 602-605; in China, 360, 366, 367; in France, 512, 538; in Germany, 29, 33; in Great Britain, 266, 269, 275, 277, 278, 280, 287, 288, 581; in Hungary, 170; in Italy, 86, 544; in the United States, 205, 212, 516, 561-563, 574, 580, 606-608, 629, 630, 631.
 Eight Hour Day. *See* Work Day, Shorter.
 Elections. *See* Names of Countries.
 Electoral Reform, 38, 41, 46, 50, 205, 258, 261, 266, 272, 277, 289, 366, 391; *see also* Universal Suffrage, Woman Suffrage,

Proportional Representation, and Second Ballot.
 Emilia, Reggio, Congress of, 419.
Encyclopédie Socialiste, 5.
 Engels, Frederick, 4.
 England, 7, 18, 19, 22, 53, 59, 255-298; *see also* Great Britain, Clericalism, Government Ownership, High Cost of Living.
 Erfurt Congress, 9.
 Ewing, Sir Thomas, 521.
 Exportation of Arms, Prohibition of, 623.

F

Fabian Society, 255, 281, 285-291.
 Federalism, 161, 189, 622.
 Ferri, 12, 17, 81.
 Finland, 25, 103-107; *see also* Taxation.
 Fischer, Edmund, 52.
 Fisher, Andrew, 325, 329, 331, 517, 519, 521.
 Foreign Concessions, 630.
 France, 11, 19, 23, 57-69; *see also* Clericalism, Education, French Parties, Government Ownership, High Cost of Living, Labor Unions, Militarism, Social Insurance, Taxation, Universal Suffrage.
 Franckel, Leo, 7.
 Franco-German *Rapprochement*, 64, 69.
 Franco, Joao, 180.
 Freemasons, 92.
 Free Press, 204.
 Free Speech in Assemblage, 33, 40, 41, 100 ff., 166, 204.
 French Parties, Independent Socialist, 57, 65; Labor, 7; Monarchist and Nationalist, 65; Progressist, 65; Republican, 65; Radical, 65; Socialist Radical, 17, 65; Socialist, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 17, 25, 57-69.
 Friedberg, Dr., 390.

G

- General Strike, 9, 73, 376, 389-430, 548. *See* Strikes.
- German Parties, 15, 59, 171; Anti-Semitic, 37, 48; Bethmann-Holweg *bloc*, 48; Bue-low *bloc*, 48; Center, 37, 48; Conservative, 37; Free Conservative, 48; Independent, 9; Liberal, 52; Social Democratic, 4, 5, 6, 10, 23, 27-56.
- Germany, Socialist Movement in, 25, 27-56; Dresden Congress, 15, 19; Militarism, 20; Monarchical, 20; *see also* Clericalism, Education, German Parties, Government Ownership, High Cost of Living, Militarism, Social Insurance, Taxation, Universal Suffrage.
- Germer, Adolph, 249.
- Ghent, Wm. J., 208.
- Ghesquiere, 376, 378.
- Giolitti, Giovanni, 85, 90.
- Glasier, J. Bruce, 282.
- Goebel, Geo. H., 249, 624.
- Goehre, Paul, 30.
- Goremykin, 102.
- Government Employees, 184, 215.
- Government Ownership, 477 ff.; in Australia, 309, 320, 322, 327, 332, 333; in China, 360; in England, 257, 269, 275, 286, 472, 479; in France, 17, 22, 449; in Germany, 478-479, 492; in New Zealand, 348; in the United States, 203, 216, 220, 630, 631; *see also* Municipal Problems, Municipal Socialism, Nationalization.
- Graham, Cunningham, 6.
- Great Britain, Socialist Movement in, 25, 255-298; *see also* Education, England, Labor Unions, Militarism, Taxation, Universal Suffrage.
- Greece, Socialist Movement in, 25, 188-190; *see also* Labor Unions.
- Guesde, Jules, 12, 14, 17.

H

- Hamburg, 29.
- Hardie, J. Keir, 6.
- Haywood, Wm. D., 224, 382, 384, 387.
- Heine, Wolfgang, 52, 53, 55.
- Hervé, 60, 61, 62.
- Het Volk*, 122.
- Heydebrand, 35.
- Hickey, P., 427.
- High Cost of Living, 446-453; in Australia, 314-317, 333, 336, 434, 436; in Austria, 158; in England, 275, 276, 447, 448, 450-452; in France, 448-450; in Germany, 37, 39, 487; in Spain, 175; in the United States, 200, 562, 563.
- Hillquit, Morris, 231, 483, 500, 609, 625.
- Holland, 7, 11, 25, 108-127; *see also* Clericalism, Parties in, Militarism, Social Insurance, Taxation, Universal Suffrage.
- Holland, Parties in, Catholic, 114; Calvinist, 114; Christian Historic, 114; Free Liberal, 113, 114; Marxian Socialist, 112, 114, 125; Progressive Democratic, 114; Social Democratic Labor, 25, 114.
- Holman, 528, 530.
- Holst, Roland, 390.
- Home Rule, 33, 184, 212, 261, 266, 268, 276, 281, 299, 303, 305, 544, 560, 573, 577.
- House of Lords, Veto, 259, 261, 263.
- Housing, 269, 270, 273, 288, 440, 451, 457, 538, 544, 560, 579.
- Hughes, Wm. M., 521.
- Hungary, Socialist Movement in, 7, 25, 162-171; *see also* Education, Labor Unions, Militarism, Universal Suffrage.
- Hunter, Robert, 500.
- Hutchinson, Robert H., 433.
- Huysmans, Camille, 14, 293, 395, 396.
- Hyndman, H. M., 295, 296, 471.

I

Iglesias, Pablo, 172.
 Immigration, 164, 175, 189, 327, 333, 448, 450; Immigration and the Race Problem, 495-508.
 Imperialism, 6; *see also* Militarism.
 Import Duties, 481-484.
 Income Tax. *See* Taxation.
 Indemnities, 622.
 Independent Labor Party, 255-264, 280; Program, 257.
 Industrial Unionism. *See* Syndicalism.
 Inheritance Tax. *See* Taxation.
 Initiative and Referendum, 11, 33, 184, 205, 213, 230, 239, 323, 329, 333, 348, 523, 537, 550, 553, 559, 573.
 Injunction, Abolition of, 211.
 Insanity, 200.
 Intermarriage. *See* Race Question.
 Internationalism. *See* Militarism.
 International Ownership, 622.
 International Socialist Bureau, 4, 14, 187, 294, 515.
 International Socialist Movement, 3-26.
International Socialist Review, 152.
 Intervention, Mexico, 247.
 Ireland, Socialist Movement in, 13, 259, 299-308; *see also* Clericalism, Labor Unions.
 Irving, Dan, 295.
 Italy, 18, 76-94; *see also* Clericalism, Education, Italian Parties, Militarism, Universal Suffrage.
 Italian Parties, Independent, 87; Radical, 87; Reformist Party, 76; Reformist Socialist Party, 76, 81, 87; Socialist Party, 7, 13, 25, 76-94.

J

James, Alfred, 328.
 Jaurès, 12, 14, 16, 19-23, 62, 67, 377, 378, 511, 527.

Jena Congress, 11, 40.
 Jewish Socialists, 97; Equal Rights of, 184; Expulsion of, 182.
 Jimenez, Angel M., 250.
 Jowett, F. W., 260, 263, 514, 611, 612.
 Justo, Juan, 249.

K

Kautsky, 12, 15, 16, 17, 43, 292, 390.
 Kerensky, 100, 101, 103.
 Knee, F., 525, 526.
 Kiang, Kang Hu, 361.
 Kitchener, 520.
 Kohevalov, 103.

L

Labor Disputes. *See* Compulsory Arbitration, Strike, General Strike.
 Labor, Hours of. *See* Workday, Shorter.
Labor Leader, 327.
 Labor Legislation, 438-440; *see also* Child Labor, Compulsory Arbitration, Minimum Wage, Right to Organize, Truck System, Social Insurance, Unemployment Insurance, Shorter Workday.
 Labor Parties, 7, 239, 255, 264, 266, 284, 305, 309-334, 431.
 Labor Unions, 4, 10, 12, 18, 182, 373-388, 442, 495, 496, 502; in Australia, 338, 506; in Belgium, 71, 75, 409; in Canada, 240; in Denmark, 131; in France, 375-378; in Great Britain, 255, 257, 268, 272, 294, 297; in Greece, 190; in Hungary, 163; in Ireland, 303, 307; in New Zealand, 340, 342, 346; in Roumania, 181, 182; in South Africa, 507; in Sweden, 409; in the United States, 378-388.
 Labriola, 81, 89.

Lafont, 591.
 Land Question, 247, 248, 286,
 287, 301, 322, 332, 349, 366,
 456, 458, 459, 465-474, 493,
 581; *see also* Agriculture.
 Larkin, James, 303, 305.
 Lasalle, Ferdinand, 491.
L'Asino, 76.
 Latimer, 525.
 Laukki, Leo, 502.
 Lavroff, Pierre, 7.
 Lawrence, Miss Susan, 290.
 Ledebour, George, 47.
 Lee, Algernon, 3.
 Legge, 520.
L'Egalité, 57.
Leipzig Volkszeitung, 55.
 Leken, 396.
 Lerda, 78, 92.
 Le Sueur, Arthur, 480, 555, 625.
 Letts, 97.
 Lewis, 524.
L'Humanité, 67.
 Liebknecht, Karl, 409, 413.
 Liebknecht, Wm., 6, 10, 12.
 Lindhagen, 145.
 Lloyd-George, David, 282, 338.
 London, Congress, 11.
 London, Meyer, 502.
 Longuet, Jean, 5, 8, 9, 11, 12.
 Lucci, 93, 539 ff., 543, 546.
 Lunn, George R., 569, 570, 594.
 Luxemburg, Socialist Vote in,
 25.
 Luxemburg, Rosa, 405, 409, 412,
 413.

M

Macdonald, Ramsay, 260, 262,
 447, 527, 530.
 Mackenzie, T., 343.
 Madero, Francisco, 246.
 Magyar, nobles, 168, 171.
 Maison du Peuple, 14.
 Maklakov, 100.
 Manoel, King, 177.
 Marx, Eleanor, 6.
 Marx, Karl, 4, 57, 384, 498.
 Maurer, James H., 249, 626.
 Maximilian, Emperor, 425.

Medical Service, Free, 269, 579.
 Membership of Socialist Par-
 ties, 25; *see also* Names of
 Countries.
 Mercer, J. N., 479.
Metropolitan Magazine, 3.
 Mexico, 243-249.
 Migoel, Dom, 177.
 Milan, 90.
 Militarism, 91, 509-522, 609 ff.;
 in Australia, 329, 332, 333,
 337, 338, 516-522; in Austria,
 157, 165; in China, 366; in
 Denmark, 133, 136; in France,
 58, 61, 62, 376, 450, 510-514,
 611-612; in Germany, 35, 43,
 410, 411, 486 ff., 613; in Great
 Britain, 259, 280, 614-618; in
 Holland, 118, 121, 618; in
 Hungary, 170; in Italy, 515;
 in New Zealand, 348, 349; in
 Sweden, 149, 152; in Switzer-
 land, 618; in the United
 States, 515-516, 619 ff.; *see*
 also Preparedness, Disarma-
 ment.
 Millerand, 12, 14, 23, 57, 66, 119.
 Mills, W. T., 340.
 Minimum Wage, 24, 204, 257,
 267, 269, 270, 271, 275, 287,
 332, 348, 440, 444, 447, 452,
 455, 479, 504, 537.
 Molkenbuhr, 6.
 Monarchism. *See* Republican-
 ism.
 Monopolies. *See* Trusts.
 Morocco War, 175; Adventure,
 58, 63.
Muenchener Post, 54.
 Municipal Ownership. *See* Mu-
 nicipal Socialism, Municipal
 Problems.
 Municipal Problems, 58, 90, 93,
 153, 162, 220, 258, 549, 552,
 558, 562; *see also* Municipal
 Socialism.
 Municipal Socialism, 532-581;
 see also Municipal Problems.
 Mussolini, 92.

N

Nationalism. *See* Militarism,
Names of Countries.
Nationalist Parties. *See* Names
of Countries.
Nationalization, Industry, 322,
327, 623, 624, 631; Land, 270;
Mines, 269, 270, 275; Railway,
266, 269, 270, 274, 322;
Trusts, 309, 320; *see also*
Government Ownership.

Naumann, 35.

Nepeszava, 163.

Neue Zeit, Die, 47, 88, 104, 155,
163.

Neutralization of Seas, 622.

New Statesman, The, 333, 340.

New Zealand, Socialist and La-
bor Movements in, 25, 340-
353; *see also* Government
Ownership, Labor Unions,
Militarism, Social Insurance.

Nieuwenhuis, Domela, 7.

Norway, Socialist Movement in,
7, 25, 153-154.

Numbers of Socialist Voters and
Party Members. *See* Names
of Countries.

O

O'Brien, C. M., 237.

Occupations of Socialist Legis-
lators, 30, 67.

Olberg, Oda, 88, 418, 541.

P

Pacifism. *See* Militarism.

Palacios, Alfredo, 249, 253.

Paris, International Socialist
Congresses at, 4, 6, 12, 15, 19;
Commune of, 7.

Parker, James, 260.

Parties, Political. (For brief
references to all political par-
ties, *see* Names of Countries.)

Party Machine, 222, 228.

Patents, Collective Ownership,
204.

Peace. *See* Militarism.

Pearce, H., 295.

Peasants, 31, 68, 82, 95, 146, 182.

Pelloutier, Fernand, 11.

Penal Reform. *See* Crime.

Pensions. *See* Social Insurance.

Peonage, 248.

Peraccina, 422.

Petrovsky, 103.

Place, Jack, 238.

Platform, Socialist and Labor
Parties. *See* Names of Coun-
tries.

Plebiscites, 622.

Plechhanoff, 7, 13, 16.

Podrecca, 76, 78.

Police. *See* Violence.

Polish Socialists, 13, 97.

Political Action, 9-12, 19, 28,
158, 221-228, 270, 378, 380,
407.

Portugal, Socialist Movement
in, 7, 25, 176-180.

Pouget, Emile, 381, 382.

Poverty, 200, 269.

Preparedness, 609 ff.

Presidential Veto, Abolition of,
205.

Prices, Maximum, 447, 450; *see
also* High Cost of Living.

Programs, Socialist and Labor
Parties. *See* Names of Coun-
tries.

Progressive Parties. *See* Coun-
tries.

Prohibition. *See* The Drink
Problem.

Proportional Representation, 11,
33, 64, 150, 184, 205, 273, 348,
351, 523-531, 537, 551, 558.

Prostitution, 200, 219, 366, 569.

Protection. *See* Tariff.

Protestant Churches, 30.

Prussia, Monarchical Power, 53.

Public Health, 561, 568, 581.

Public Ownership. *See* Govern-
ment Ownership, Municipal
Socialism, Nationalization.

Public Works, 442, 445, 457, 512,
544, 559, 563, 572, 573.

Q

Quelch, L. E., 474.

R

- Race Question, 354, 495-508, 522.
 Racovsky, Dr. C., 181.
 Radicals. *See* Countries.
 Raimondo, 93.
 Ralli, 539, 540.
 Recall, 184, 205, 213, 218, 348, 351, 523, 550, 553.
 Referendum. *See* Initiative and Referendum.
 Reformism, 17, 18, 20, 43, 79, 80, 82, 155, 156, 158, 226, 420.
 Reichstag, The, 28; Rights of, 46.
 Republicanism, 16, 20, 23, 52-56, 55, 67, 70, 81, 99, 145, 363, 366, 418, 424, 425, 547.
 Revisionism. *See* Reformism.
 Revisionists, 15.
 Revolution, 10, 16, 18, 19, 37, 78, 98, 156, 161, 202, 243, 265, 363, 367, 378, 425, 547, 614, 617, 626.
 Richardson, Thomas, 260.
 Rigg, R. A., 241.
 Right to Organize, 38, 64, 439, 444, 537, 559, 563.
 Roberts, 270.
 Rockefeller, John D., 318.
 Rodzianko, 101.
 Rolf, H. J., 596.
 Roosevelt, Theodore, 319.
 Rossignol, J. E., 426.
 Rouanet, 67.
 Roumania, 171; Socialist Movement in, 7, 25, 181-187; *see also* Clericalism, Labor Unions, Taxation, Universal Suffrage.
 Russia, 95-103; *see also* Russian Parties.
 Russian Parties, Labor, 95, 96, 97, 100; Peasants', 95, 100; Social Democratic, 7, 10, 13, 25, 95-103; Social Revolutionary, 95.
 Ruthenians, 157.
- S
- Sabotage, 228 ff., 381 ff.
 Sandberg, Karl, 480.
 Sanders, W. Stephen, 281, 289, 597.
 Sanial, Lucien, 480.
 Santos, Machado, 177.
 Saturday Half Holiday, 34, 204, 439, 444.
 Saxony, 19, 29.
 Schaper, 122.
 Scheidemann, 43, 47, 409, 410, 413, 414, 416.
 Scholarships, 538.
 School Children, Feeding, 266, 269, 288, 440, 538, 574.
 Schultz, Heinrich, 613.
 Scotland. *See* Great Britain.
 Second Ballot, 11, 40-46, 63, 289, 349, 526, 558.
 Secret Diplomacy, 622, 630.
 Seidel, Emil, 575.
 Senape, 93.
 Servants, Legislation for, 34; Exemption from Contribution to Insurance Funds, 38.
 Serbia, Socialist Vote in, 25.
 Shaw, G. Bernard, 290.
 Shaw, Tom, 282.
 Simons, A. M., 626.
 Simpson, James, 238.
Sinn Fein, 302.
 Slavonic, 171.
 Slovenians, 157.
 Smilie, Robert, 261.
 Smith, Herbert, 479.
 Snowden, Phillip, 260, 261, 528, 598.
 Social Insurance, 439, 445; in Australia, 324, 327, 332-334; in France, 64, 538; in Germany, 38, 442, 443, 535; in Great Britain, 257, 270, 280, 286, 289; in Holland, 112, 118, 120, 122, 125; in New Zealand, 348; in the United States, 212, 215, 217, 559.
Socialists and the War, 5, 8.
 Social Reform. *See* Labor Legislation.
 Socialist Unity, 288.
 Socialization. *See* Government Ownership.
 Solf, 48.

Solomon, U., 524.
 Song Chi Ying, 368.
 South Africa, Labor Movement
 in, 354-355; *see also* Labor
 Unions.

Sozial Demokraten, 154.

Spain, Socialist Movement in, 6,
 9, 25, 172-176; *see also* High
 Cost of Living, Taxation.

Spargo, John, 378, 379, 381, 502,
 556, 627.

Stauning, 132.

Strikes, 121, 215, 270, 559, 563,
 574; Australia, 321, 336, 337,
 519; Mines, 271; Policy, 270;
 Port of London, 267; *see also*
 General Strikes, Violence.

Studholme, Allan, 242.

Stuttgart International Con-
 gress, 5.

Suffrage. *See* Universal Suf-
 frage, Woman Suffrage.

Supreme Court, Abolition of
 Power of, 205.

Sweating, 269.

Sweden, Socialist Movement in,
 7, 25, 145-153; *see also* Labor
 Unions, Militarism, Taxation,
 Universal Suffrage.

Swiss Parties, Social Demo-
 cratic, 25, 127, 128, 618.

Switzerland, 19, 127-128; *see*
 also Militarism, Swiss Parties.

Sun Yat Sen, 358 ff.

Syndicalism, 68, 76, 87, 125, 178,
 340, 376, 378-381, 413, 417,
 422; *see also* Sabotage.

T

Tariff, 39, 41, 80, 82, 133, 320,
 329, 333, 448, 449, 450, 481,
 581, 616.

Tartars, 97.

Taxation, 91, 445, 485-494; in
 Belgium, 392; in Finland, 106;
 in France, 17, 20, 60, 63,
 449, 450, 456, 512; in Ger-
 many, 33-38, 39, 41, 49, 487-
 494; in Great Britain, 258,
 269, 276, 287, 288, 581; in

Holland, 120; in Roumania,
 185; in Spain, 175; in
 Sweden, 147; in the United
 States, 212, 218, 467, 566, 567,
 575; *see also* Import Duties
 and Land Question.

Tcheidze, 99.

Terrorists, 10.

Thiessen, W., 251.

Thomas, Albert, 61.

Thompson, Carl D., 557, 627.

Thorne, W., 597.

Timm Resolution, 442, 443.

Tisza, 166.

Trade Unions. *See* Labor
 Unions.

Tregear, Edward, 348.

Tripoli War, 76, 77, 81, 90, 549.

Troelstra, 120, 292.

Truck System Prohibited, 34.

Trusts, 314-320, 329, 334, 337,
 338, 448, 475-476.

Tschechenelli, 102.

Turin, 90.

U

Ugarte, Manuel, 252.

Unemployment, 164, 200, 203,
 214, 266, 270, 348, 351, 441-
 445, 544, 560, 564, 578; Pre-
 vention, 275, 440.

Unemployment Insurance. *See*
 Social Insurance.

Unicameral System. *See* Bi-
 cameral System.

United States, 7, 13, 25, 378; So-
 cialist Movement in, 25, 191-
 234; *see also* Clericalism, Edu-
 cation, Government Ownership,
 High Cost of Living, Labor
 Unions, Militarism, Social In-
 surance, Taxation, Universal
 Suffrage.

Universal Suffrage, 11, 19; in
 Austria, 156; in Belgium, 392-
 403; in Canada, 239; in China,
 366; in Denmark, 129, 130,
 135; in France, 20; in Ger-
 many, 33, 38, 403 ff.; in Great
 Britain, 268; in Holland, 112,
 120, 122; in Hungary, 166,

169; in Italy, 82, 86; in Roumania, 184; in Sweden, 150; in the United States, 204, 213, 215, 623, 630.
 Untermann, Ernest, 499.
 Uruguay, Socialist Vote in, 25.

V

Vaillant, 61.
 Vandervelde, Emile, 8, 12, 14, 71.
Vanguardia, La, 250.
 Van Vliegen, 7.
 Varga, E., 163.
 Vienna Congress, 5.
 Vigna, 89.
 Villiers, B., 615.
 Violence, 20, 96, 211, 350, 376-378, 385, 409, 418, 425, 559, 574; *see also* Strike, General Strike.
 Viviani, Premier, 57.
 Volders, Jean, 6.
 Vollmar, 6, 30.
Vorwaerts, 45, 52, 54, 55, 72, 89, 105, 108, 117, 119, 132, 136, 146, 148, 152, 172, 187.
 Vote, Socialist and Labor. *See* Names of Countries.

W

Wages. *See* Minimum Wage.
 Waldeck, Rousseau, Ministry, 14.
 Walling, Wm. English, 5, 329, 383, 387.
 Walsh, Stephen T., 598, 599.
 Wanhope, Joshua, 500.
 War. *See* Militarism.

Waterways, Strategic, 622.
 Watkins, D., 325, 331.
 Watson, Chris, 521.
 Wauters, 396.
 Webb, Sidney, 291, 294, 450, 580.
 Webb, Mrs. Sidney, 290.
 Welsh Disestablishment Bill, 261, 266, 268, 276.
 Wendell, Herman, 486, 487.
Western Clarion, 235.
 Wibaut, F. M., 112.
 Williams, Parker, 238.
 Wilson, J. Stitt, 249, 500, 525, 556, 564.
 Winiarsky, L., 7.
 Woman Suffrage, 239, 258, 259, 273, 289, 348, 367, 594-601, 623.
 Workday, Shorter, 34, 38, 112, 150, 204, 211, 215, 216, 239, 257, 266, 270, 289, 348, 439, 440, 442, 444, 456, 504, 537, 559.
 Württemberg, 15.

Y

Yuan Shi Kai, 358, 361, 362, 363, 366, 368.

Z

Zaccagnini, Antonio, 250.
 Zetkin, Clara, 6.
 Zevaes, 66.
 Zurich Congress, 8, 9; Declaration of, 11; Resolution of, 9, 11.

By WILLIAM ENGLISH WALLING

Author of "*Socialism as It Is*," "*Progressivism and After*," etc.

THE SOCIALISTS AND THE WAR

12 mo, cloth, 500 pages, \$1.50 net

Three-fourths of this volume consists of documentary statements of Socialists of all countries toward the war. The impartial running editorial comments set forth the conditions under which the various statements were made and indicates why they are important.

In the final chapter Mr. Walling discusses one of the noteworthy results of the war so far—the revolutionary state Socialist measures adopted by the Governments at war.

"The volume is one of the first expressions in English of the real attitude of the European masses towards the war."—*Review of Reviews*.

"It will be found of the utmost value while the war proceeds."—*New York World*.

"It will be of great value when the question of ending the war arises."—*New York Sun*.

"Astonishingly exhaustive and thorough."—*Boston Transcript*.

"Most timely and profoundly interesting."—*Hartford Courant*.

"Only time and posterity could adequately review this absorbing book."—*The New Statesman* (London.)

HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY

34 WEST 33rd STREET

NEW YORK

BOOKS ON SOCIAL SCIENCE

SOCIAL INSURANCE

BY I. M. RUBINOW. Octavo. \$3.00 *net*.

The only comprehensive work in English on its very important subject, which includes Employers' Liability, Sick Insurance, Old Age Pensions, Insurance Against Unemployment, etc., etc.

"As a brief for State action, and as a guide to intelligent thinking, the book is most important."—*Literary Digest*.

AMERICAN LABOR UNIONS

(BY A MEMBER)

BY HELEN MAROT, Executive Secretary Women's Trades Union League. \$1.25 *net*.

The American Labor Union from the inside. What it thinks and believes and says about itself.

"One of the most important of recent books on the labor question. . . . The author has, on the whole, sensed the true inwardness of the labor movement."—*Springfield Republican*.

THE COMING NEWSPAPER

MERLE THORPE, Editor. \$1.40 *net*.

A symposium by such authorities as Oswald Garrison Villard, Melville E. Stone, Lieut. Gov. Barrett O'Hara of Illinois, Norman Hapgood, Dr. Lyman Abbott, Hamilton Holt, Percy S. Bullen, Geo. Fitch and many others, who discuss the latest developments in the methods and ethics of newspaper making, news gathering and handling, advertising, circulation, administration, and editorial direction.

HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY
PUBLISHERS (x'15) NEW YORK

BOOKS ON SOCIAL SCIENCE

SOCIALISM AND DEMOCRACY IN EUROPE

By SAMUEL P. ORTH. With bibliography and "Programs" of the various Socialist parties. \$1.50 net.

Traces briefly the growth of the Socialist movement in France, Belgium, Germany, England, and attempts to determine the relation of economic and political Socialism to Democracy.

MARXISM VERSUS SOCIALISM

By V. G. SIMKHOVITCH, Professor of Political Science, Columbia University. \$1.50 net.

A thorough and intimate account of all the intricate theories, problems and difficulties of modern Socialism.

Professor Simkhovitch shows us that the economic tendencies of to-day are quite different from what Marx expected them to be and that Socialism from the standpoint of Marx's own theory is quite impossible.

WHY WOMEN ARE SO

By MARY ROBERTS COOLIDGE. \$1.50 net.

"A fearless discussion of the modern woman, her inheritance, her present and her more promising future. The eighteenth and nineteenth century woman is keenly analyzed and compared with the highest type of woman to-day."—*A. L. A. Booklist*.

A MONTESSORI MOTHER

By DOROTHY CANFIELD FISHER. With Illustrations. \$1.25 net.

A simple untechnical account of the apparatus, the method of its application, and a clear statement of the principles underlying its use.

"Mrs. Fisher's book is the best we have seen on the subject."—*Independent*.

THE SOCIALIST MOVEMENT (Home University Library)

By J. RAMSAY MACDONALD, Chairman of the British Labor Party. 50 cents net.

Traces the development of Socialistic theory, practice, and party organization; with a summary of the progress of Socialist parties to date in the leading nations.

"Not only the latest authoritative exposition of Socialism, it is also the most moderate, restrained and winning presentation of the subject now before the public."—*San Francisco Argonaut*.

HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY
PUBLISHERS (v'13) NEW YORK

TWO BOOKS OF TIMELY SIGNIFICANCE

WALTER LIPPMANN'S THE STAKES OF DIPLOMACY

By the author of "Drift and Mastery," etc. \$1.25 net.

Even a democracy is not democratic in foreign affairs. When the emotion of patriotism and the notion of national prestige become involved with the protection of citizens and their commercial or religious interests in the backward places of the earth, we have the most fruitful source of international crises. Mr. Lippmann suggests a method of international organization which will preclude these sources of irritation from even coming into the realm of national interests. He points a way to a growth of true democracy, the liberalizing of foreign policies and the civilization of patriotism.

KATHARINE ANTHONY'S FEMINISM IN GERMANY AND SCANDINAVIA

By the author of "Mothers Who Must Earn."
\$1.25 net.

This is the first book to be published in this country containing a substantial and concrete statement of what Feminism means beyond the English Channel.

The contents includes: The Coalescence of the European Feminists—Schools and the Woman—Some Realizations in Dress Reform—The Mutterschutz Idea—State Maternity Insurance—Reclaiming the Illegitimate Child in Norway—The Economic Renaissance of the German Woman—The Valkyrie Vote—The Philosophy of Feminism—Bibliography.

HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY
34 WEST 33D STREET (x'15) NEW YORK

HX
40
W3

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Santa Barbara College Library
Santa Barbara, California

Return to desk from which borrowed.

This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

~~MAR 6 1967~~ N

~~JAN 22 1957~~

~~MAY 6 1968~~

~~APR 30 1957~~

11 16 DEC 14 11 2

~~JUN 4 1957~~

~~124 APR 11 5~~

~~FEB 3 1959~~

~~JAN 3 1961~~

INTERLIBRARY LOAN
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
SANTA BARBARA, CA 93106

~~APR 9 1962~~

RET'D SEP 05 2000 50

~~MAY 20 1963~~

~~APR 11 1965~~



3 1205 02235 6016

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



AA 000 826 632 2

